# THE DEISM OF *WILLIAM PENN, And his Brethren,*

Destructive to the

# Christian Religion,

Exposed, and plainly laid open.

IN

The Examination and Refutation of his late reprinted Book, called, *A Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practise, and Judge of Controversie.*

Wherein he contendeth.

That the Holy Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith and Life, but that the Light in the Conscience of every Man is that Rule.

By *GEORGE KEITH.*

*LONDON,*
Printed for *Brab. Aylmer* at the *Three Pigeons* against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*, 1699.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# The PREFACE to the Christian Protestant Reader.

Christian Reader,

I *Have been concerned more earnestly and amply to treat on this Subject in the following Treatise, to refute that grand Error of* William Penn *and his Brethren, who make it their great Fundamental, that the* Light within, with respect only to its ordinary and common Discoveries *given to all Mankind, to* Christians, Jews, Mahometans *and* Heathens *of all sorts,* Protestants *and* Papists, *is* the general Rule of Faith and Life *to them all: So that all under these several Denominations, are true and good Christians, and ought to own and acknowledge one another as Christian Brethren and Members of one Catholick or Universal Church, if they obey and walk according to the common and ordinary Di-*

*States thereof, without all superadded Revelation External or Internal of Christ without, as* God and Man in one Person. *But their constant Practise doth evidently contradict their Principle, for though they have acknowledged, that such of the Heathens who were or now are obedient to the common Discoveries of the Light within them, without all Faith in Christ without them, are their Christian Brethren; and for the same reason they may conclude,* Jews *and* Mahometans, *who are obedient to their Light within to be such, yet generally they disown all Christian Protestants among whom they live, be they ever so Just and Sober, and obedient to their Light within them, if they come not under their Profession and Circumstances to be Christians: And thus as some have well observed, they* Christianise

ſtianiſe *the Heathens, and* Heathen-iſe *the Chriſtians, calling them all, the Worlds People, but themſelves they call the Children of Light, the Elect People of God; and ſay of themſelves they are in the Truth, and none but they and their Deiſt and Heathen Brethren; and perhaps the Quietiſts and Followers of* Molinus (*whoſe Book they ſo much eſteem*) *among the Papiſts. This being their Fundamental and Capital Error, and the great Original and Spring of all their other Errors, that as ſo many Streams iſſue and proceed from it; the which being plainly detected (as by Divine Aſſiſtance I hope I have done in the following Treatiſe) it is greatly to be hoped (to which I joyn my earneſt and ſincere Prayers to God Almighty in the Name of Chriſt Jeſus) that it may be a means to undeceive and recover from Error*

*many*

*many of that People, if they will or dare give themſelves the liberty to read it. The Book called,* A Diſcourſe of the General Rule of Faith and Life, by *W. Penn; to which this is an Anſwer, was firſt Printed in the Year* 1673, *as an Appendix to his part of the* Chriſtian Quaker, *and is now again reprinted in this preſent Year* 1699, *which ſufficiently ſheweth, that* W. P. *and his Brethren are not changed, nor reformed from what they were ſo long ago; though his and their late Pretences, That they own the* common Principles of Chriſtianity, *and differ not* much in Doctrine *from the Church of* England, *have occaſioned ſome to think them ſomewhat Reformed of late; but it is their great Miſtake, which the Fallacies of* W. P. *and others of his Brethren, by their late Fallacious Creeds,*

*have*

*have led them into. Indeed I did not know but that it was a new Book, ſo litte had I read or conſidered the Contents of it, which by occaſion of their reprinting it this very Year, I have been awakened, and as it were alarumed, to take ſpecial notice of, and ſtrictly to examine, detect and refute, the which, whither effectually done or not, is left to the free and impartial Judgment of the Intelligent Chriſtian Proteſtant Reader. Their printing it at this juncture, doth not a little argue their great Imprudence in laying themſelves ſo open to be rank Deiſts, while they at the ſame time pretend to hold the Chriſtian Doctrine, that is point blank inconſiſtent therewith, and great boldneſs that they are not aſhamed in the face of the World to ſay, and unſay, and to be profeſs'd Deiſts and Chriſtians at once; which is as great*

*many of that People, if they will or dare give themſelves the liberty to read it. The Book called,* A Diſcourſe of the General Rule of Faith and Life, by *W. Penn; to which this is an Anſwer, was firſt Printed in the Year* 1673, *as an Appendix to his part of the* Chriſtian Quaker, *and is now again reprinted in this preſent Year* 1699, *which ſufficiently ſheweth, that* W. P. *and his Brethren are not changed, nor reformed from what they were ſo long ago; though his and their late Pretences, That they own the* common Principles of Chriſtianity, *and differ not* much in Doctrine *from the Church of* England, *have occaſioned ſome to think them ſomewhat Reformed of late; but it is their great Miſtake, which the Fallacies of* W. P. *and others of his Brethren, by their late Fallacious Creeds, have*

*have led them into. Indeed I did not know but that it was a new Book, so litte had I read or considered the Contents of it, which by occasion of their reprinting it this very Year, I have been awakened, and as it were alarumed, to take special notice of, and strictly to examine, detect and refute, the which, whither effectually done or not, is left to the free and impartial Judgment of the Intelligent Christian Protestant Reader. Their printing it at this juncture, doth not a little argue their great Imprudence in laying themselves so open to be rank Deists, while they at the same time pretend to hold the Christian Doctrine, that is point blank inconsistent therewith, and great boldness that they are not asha-med in the face of the World to say, and unsay, and to be profess'd Deists and Christians at once; which is as*

*great*

*great a Chimera or Impoſſibility, as for one and the ſame thing to be Horſe and Man at once; I mean not, one part Horſe and another part Man, for ſuch a Monſter perhaps is poſſible, but to be in all the parts both Man and Horſe, without all Redundancy or Deficiency of either; which as impoſſible as it is to be in Nature, it is as impoſſible that* W. P. *and his Brethren can be both* Deiſts *and* true Chriſtians *at once; that they are* Deiſts, *the Book to which this is an Anſwer, doth ſufficiently prove: And therefore notwithſtanding all their late Pretences, till they retract that and their other former Books, true Chriſtians they cannot be.*

4. FE 62

ERRATA.

PAge 35. Line 13. read *imperfect*. p. 43. l. 10. for *regulus* read *regulans*. p. 75. l. 2. for *lad* r. *and*. p. 99. l. 12. for 13 r. 3.

The

# The DEISM of *William Penn*, and his Brethren, Destructive to the Christian Religion, Exposed, and plainly laid open.

## The Introduction.

*Shewing the great Importance of our knowing what the True Rule of Faith and Life is: And containing a Retractation of some Unsound and Erroneous Passages in some of my former Books about the* Rule of Faith, *yet no-wise so Erronious as the Doctrine of* W. P. *nor being of that Tendency, as his is, to introduce Deism.*

Page 3. THE saith, *Since there are so many Faiths in the World, and perplex'd Controversies about them, that is greatly behoves every Man, if he contend for, then, first to know the True Faith*

*that overcometh the World. Concerning the General Rule of Faith and Life, he is press'd to say something from that weighty Consideration, That Men Perish for want of it, and can no more arrive at Truth without it, than the distressed Mariner can gain his Port, who Sails without either Star or Compass.* This his weighty Consideration is a plain Confession, That he not having a right and true understanding of the Rule of Faith, what it is, is of very dangerous Consequence, even no less than Perishing and Destruction to all such who want the true Knowledge of it, and set up another thing in the room of it. It may therefore be very necessary for *W. P.* to consider the Matter a little more weightily, that in case he himself have not the true Knowledge of the Rule of Faith and Life, in what danger he is of Perishing: And how, (in this his Work, of labouring to bring all People under a Christian Profession, that give up to believe him, to another Rule of Faith and Life, than what is the true Rule indeed,) If he persist in so doing, he will not only bring his own Blood upon himself, but the Blood of many others, that are and may be mislead by him. And whether he will yet better consider it or not, which I heartily wish, and pray, that God would be pleased to open his Eyes, and give him Repentance, and a better Understanding: It is a plain Case, That the true Know-

Knowledge of the true Rule of Faith and Life is very neceſſary, yea, ſo neceſſary, that the Danger for want of it is Periſhing or Deſtruction. Yet I mean not, that every Error in Circumſtance, about the true Rule, is of that Danger; or that ſome looſe and indeliberate Expreſſions, that ſome have uſed in Preaching or Printing, while their Meaning hath been more ſound than their Words, even about the RULE, are of that Conſequence. It hath happened to ſome well-meaning People, as it had happened to my ſelf, that they and I have both ſpoke and writ unadviſedly: As in ſome other Matters, ſo in this, running along, or rather being carried along with the Stream of ſome of the ancient Friends, ſo called of the Miniſtry, in aſſerting, both in Speech and Print, too frequently, that the Spirit within, meaning the inward Evidence of the Spirit, as touching the great Matters of the Chriſtian Faith and Practiſe, was the principal Rule of Faith and Life, wherein I acknowledge my Error and great Miſtake, and do here particularly retract it, notwithſtanding the general Retractation I have lately made, in my late Book called, G. K's *Explications and Retractations.* But tho' I was then in an Error, and under a great Miſtake, in my way of wording the Matter, and darkned too much and clouded in my Underſtanding in that very Point, yet I crave leave of my Reader to ſhew, that even then

my Error was not Fundamental, nor ſuch as this is of *W. Penn*'s and his Brethren, whoſe Error in the Caſe has carried them to plain Deiſm. My Miſtake chiefly conſiſted in this, in confounding the Term *Rule of Faith*, with the Term *Inward objective Medium*, which I ought to have diſtinguiſhed, for the Rule of Faith, is not (properly ſpeaking) that formal object of Faith, called by ſome, *Objectum formale quo*, or objective Medium and Motive of Credibility, but the material Objects of Faith, to wit, all the *Credenda* or things in Scripture that ought to be believed, are the Rule of Faith: And therefore inſtead of ſaying, the Spirits inward Evidence and Teſtimony was the Rule of Faith, and principal Rule; I ſhould have ſaid, it was the *principal objective Medium of Credibility:* Which as I then did believe and aſſert, ſo I do ſtill, and hope never to retract it. And therefore while I continue adhering to this Perſwaſion, I remain (as *to the main*) the ſame I was in my Judgment, as when I wrote my former Books touching theſe Matters; my chief Bent and Zeal being, againſt that which I judged a very Erronious Opinion, and Hurtful, held by ſome counted Learned Men, and which I judge ſtill that ſo it is, to wit, That the *inward Evidence* of the Spirit in the Souls of the Faithful, to the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion, is only Effective and not Objective; and I pleaded warmly,

warmly, that the *Spirits inward Evidence*, otherwiſe called *Teſtimony, Witneſs, Inſpiration, Illumination*, or *Operation* in the Souls of the Faithful, is not only *Effective*, but *Objective* alſo, to wit, by way of *formal Object*, or *objective Medium*, and *Motive of Credibility*. And this I reckoned then, and do ſtill, the greateſt Certainty and Aſſurance, that the Scriptures are of Divine Authority, and infallibly true; wherein I knew, and ſtill know, I had the beſt Proteſtant Authors, both for Piety and ſolid Learning, on my ſide, as alſo my Feeling, and Experience (to the Praiſe of God's Grace I ſay it) in the Caſe hath confirmed me; though I know ſome called Learned Men, who have more of that called *Divinity Learning* in their Heads, than in their Hearts, do contradict it; yea, to a Degree of Ridiculing it, under the Name of Fanaticiſm and Enthuſiaſm, not well regarding the Authority of their worthy and judicious Anceſtors, who in the Articles of the Church have expreſly mentioned, the Feeling of the Holy Ghoſt in his Operations and Motions But I erred in calling this either inward Feeling, or the Object of it, the principal Rule, for properly and rightly ſpeaking, it is not the Rule of Faith; but the *principal Motive of Credibility*. That which is only, ſtrictly and properly ſpeaking, the Rule of the Chriſtian Faith, is the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures; eſpeci-

ally reſpecting the great Fundamentals and Eſſentials thereof. To give a preference to the inward Operation of the Spirit, and his writing his Law in the Heart, to the ſame Law as writ on leaves of Paper; and to the experimental part of Chriſtianity, above all that can be outwardly told, or heard, or read. I think no true Chriſtian will deny, but when it is ask'd, which is the greater Rule, the Inward or the Outward, they compare things that are not to be compared, that cannot be ſaid to be either the greater Rule, or the leſſer, which is, properly ſpeaking, no Rule at all, but the moving or impulſive Cauſe, that moves and inclines me to take the Holy Scriptures to be my Rule, being infallibly true, and of Divine Authority. And whoever be yet in the ſame Miſtake and Error that I then was in, God forbid that I ſhould judge ſo uncharitably of them, as to conclude they err Fundamentally, for want of not giving right Names to things; or not having ſo clear inward Idea's and Conceptions of them, when (*as to the main*) they mean well. I am bold to appeal to my Books from firſt to laſt, whither according to the Strain and Intent, in all that I have Printed on that Subject, I have not always acknowledged, that the Doctrine of Chriſt Crucified, and Remiſſion of Sin by his Blood, and other Doctrinal Principles of Chriſtianity, were abſolutely neceſſary to be believed

believed by us for our Eternal Salvation: And that the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, as outwardly conveighed to us, by Preaching or Reading, is the ordinary Means whereby God works Faith, and Converſion, and Regeneration, in them that ſhall be Saved; And that therefore ſo long as we live, we are not to lay aſide either that, or any outward means of Grace and Salvation that God has afforded. And how far I have formerly denied, that the Scripture was the Rule of Faith, I meant, that as it was not the Letter or Writing, ſo nor the Doctrine, as ſimply and wholly limited and confined to the Letter. As if it ſhould happen by Divine Providence, that a Perſon, or Company of Perſons, ſhould have the Holy Bible by Violence taken from them, or not have it in any Language they can underſtand, that therefore they are not in a poſſible State of Salvation: For though in God's ordinary way, the Letter or Leaves of the Book, ſince the Writing of the Scriptures, are as it were, the Repoſitory, or Ark, where God's Law is preſerved, and to which a Recourſe ought frequently to be made, to read therein for daily Information and Inſtruction: Yet the Doctrine is not ſo limited, or confined to the Letter or Leaves of a Book, but that the ſame Doctrine may be well and ſoundly preached, and believed, where the Book either hath not come, or by Violence

of Men has been taken away; as it hath been reported, that Perſecutors have taken away the Bible from ſome Faithful Martyrs of Chriſt; but though they took the Letter out of their hands, they could not take the Word of God, to wit, the Doctrine and true Senſe of it out of their Hearts. And ſo far as I can remember, it was never my Perſwaſion, what *W. P.* here layeth down in his Book, by way of Poſition, that the Light in every Man's Conſcience, or the Dictates and Teſtimony of it, abſtractly conſidered, from the peculiar Doctrines of Chriſtianity, are the Rule of Faith to Chriſtian Men. If any ſhall find that or the like Doctrine in any of my Books, on the firſt Intimation of it, I declare I ſhall (by God's help) be ready to retract it, and condemn it as moſt Erroneous, and as a Fundamental Error; for it is plain *Deiſm*, of which I have not the leaſt remembrance that ever I was guilty, as *W. P.* hath now plainly manifeſted his *Deiſm*, in this Book I have under Examination.

## Section 1.

*The Definitions of* General Rule *and* Faith, *given by* W. P. *not to be allowed, becauſe there is no ſuch General Rule and Faith, as he defineth.*

BEfore he comes to his Arguments, he gives us his Definitions of General Rule and Faith. *By General Rule* (ſaith he) *we underſtand that conſtant Meaſure, by which Men in all Ages have been enabled to judge of the Truth or Error of Doctrines, and the Good or Evil of Thoughts, Words or Actions.*

*Anſw.* Here he undertakes to define a thing, that by the Definition of it, plainly demonſtrates, That it is not in being, nor ever was in any Ages of the World, ever ſince the Diſtinction betwixt God's Church and the World came to be. I ſay, ever ſince that Diſtinction, all Mankind, in all Reſpects, Caſes and Conditions, never had one General Rule; ſo his Definition is, as if one ſhould define a golden Mountain, or ſomething that never yet hath been, ſince the Diſtinction above-mentioned. Poſſibly in *Adam*'s Family, for ſome time, (God only knoweth how long) all Men belonging to it, had one Rule univerſally, but it is more than he can prove, that this was only the

the Light in every of their Consciences, by its common Discoveries; for *Adam* himself had special Revelation, (whither by outward Vision, and an outward Voice, or only by internal Inspiration, is not necessary at present to determine) which taught him to expect Salvation by the promised Seed of the Woman; and this Doctrine no doubt he preached to his Family. That the Light, or common discovery of the Light, in every Man's Conscience, may be called a General Rule of Moral Justice and Temperance, called by *Paul*, (*Rom.* 1. 19.) the Law writ in the Heart, may and ought to be granted, but this General Rule did not extend, nor doth, to be the Rule, or a Rule of the Faith of Remission of Sin, by the Blood of the promised Seed of the Woman, the Lamb of God that was to be slain, and should take away the Sin of the World. And seeing the Light in every Conscience teacheth nothing of this Faith, that in Scripture is called the Faith of God's Elect, and the common Faith, to wit, of the Faithful in all Ages. Therefore *W. P.* in the very entry of his Work, maketh a great Stumble, and useth a great Fallacy, as if all Mankind, ever since the Dispersion of the Nations, to this day, had one general Rule of Faith and Life, and that was the Light in every Conscience, abstractly consider'd from all External Helps and Means, both of Knowledge and Faith. Let *W. P.* tell us, whether the

the Light by its common diſcovery in every Man's Conſcience, taught or gave the Command of Sacrificing. If he ſay, God, or the Spirit that is God, taught them to Sacrifice, he ſhifts the Queſtion, which is not what God did teach by ſpecial Revelation, but what he did teach Men generally in all Ages, by common Illumination, the Dictates of which are in great part generally the ſame, to all Men in all Ages, but ſo is not that either of Sacrifices or Circumciſion, or many other things that God commanded to ſome and not to others, and to ſome in one Age and not in another, ſuch a general Rule of Morality or moral Juſtice has been, is, and ever will be, in the World: But what is this to the Rule of the Chriſtian Faith, which for Subſtance is the ſame with the Faith of all the Fathers, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *David*, &c.? It is eaſie to eſpy *W. P*'s Deſign in this his Undertaking, if he can prove that there is but one General Rule of Faith and Life to all Mankind, the next ſtep is, by good Conſequence, that all Mankind ought to have but one Faith, and one Religion, and that is Deiſm and Paganiſm with a witneſs. The one Faith that the Scripture mentioneth, is not one Faith of all Mankind, but one Faith of God's Church, which is called the Faith of God's Elect, when that Bleſſed Time ſhall come, that the Goſpel ſhall be outwardly

preach'd

preach'd to all Nations, as our Saviour hath foretold it ſhall be, it is juſtly hoped that there will be a General Rule of Faith and Life to all Mankind that then ſhall live, but to talk of ſuch a thing now, and to define a thing which is not, and write a Book about it, is like *T. More's Utopia.*

Page 4. He is as Unſucceſsful and Fallacious in his Definition of Faith: *By Faith* (ſaith he) *we underſtand an Aſſent of the Mind, in ſuch manner to the Diſcoveries made of God thereto, as to reſign up to God, and have dependence upon him, as the great Creator and Saviour of his People.* This Definition of Faith, indeed, ſuits well with the Definition of his General Rule of Faith. But there are many parts of Mankind, that have not only a Faith in God, as the great Creator [the Faith here only defined by him] but have a Faith in Chriſt too, and in God the Saviour and Redeemer, conſidered as in the Perſon of a Mediator, who is both God and Man, by which Faith in Chriſt, they have a moſt firm Faith in God, grounded upon God's Promiſes, which are all Yea and Amen in Chriſt. And here in *W. P's* Definition of this Pagan and Deiſt Faith, he ſuppoſes that which will not be granted to him, *viz. That any ever had ſuch a Faith in God, as to reſign up to God and have dependence upon him, as the great Creator and Saviour of his People, without*

*out all Faith in Chriſt, conſidered as God-Man.* If by the Saviour of his People, he means ſuch a Saviour as ſaves them with eternal Salvation, and makes them Heirs of God, and Co-heirs with Chriſt; I ſay without all Faith, either *explicit* or *implicit*. That ſome of the *Gentiles* who endeavoured to live up to ſome Moral Principles, diſcovered to them by the Light in their Conſciences, and the Improvements that their reaſonable Faculties made, being enlightned thereby, by viewing the Works of Creation and general Providence, had a kind of Faith and Hope in God, that prompted them to expect Temporal Bleſſings, and ſome Temporal Rewards, from the Obſervation they could make, that Divine Providence did ordinarily beſtow ſuch Bleſſings upon Men that were morally honeſt, may, and ought to be granted: But this is not the Faith of God's Elect, and of the Heirs of eternal Salvation, that is grounded upon the Faithful Word of God, and his Faithful Promiſes firſt delivered to hisHoly Prophets and Apoſtles, and by them to us, even ſuch a word of Faith, as that, *It is a faithful ſaying, that Jeſus Chriſt is come into the World to ſave Sinners*, 1 Tim. 1. 15. For *to him gave all the Prophets witneſs* (as *Peter* preached to *Cornelius*) *that whoever believeth in him, ſhould receive remiſſion of Sins*, Acts 10. 43. God's Promiſes

Promiſes come not to Men, nor ever came to them, by the common Dictates of the Light within, whither they call it God, or the Word, or the Spirit, there are diverſities of Operations, Gifts and Miniſtrations, inward as well as outward of one God, one Lord, and one Spirit, who is over all, in all, and through all. It is but a faint Hope and Faith, that Men can have in God, without the Promiſes, and without all ſpecial Revelation. The knowledge of God's Goodneſs, diſcoverable by the Light in every Conſcience, in the Works of Creation and Providence, may give Men, that are morally honeſt, ſome probable Faith, that he will be favourable to them: But the infallible ground of certainty, concerning eternal Life and Salvation, none ever had, or can have, without the Promiſes and ſpecial Revelation. For all the Light and Knowledge that the *Epheſian Gentiles* had, in their meer *Gentile* State, *Paul* told, *That at that time they were without hope, and without the Promiſes, and aliens and ſtrangers to the common-wealth of Iſrael*, Eph. 2. 12. An indigent Man, that knows a good Man, that is able to help him, yet he is not ſure that he will help him, unleſs he has his promiſe, and ſome particular intimation of his mind; but if he have that, then his Faith hath ſure footing. But the Faithful have not only God's

Word

Word and Promiſes, but confirmed by his Oath, that by two immutable things, they might have ſtrong Confidence, and Hope, that is, as an Anchor, ſure and ſtedfaſt, and which enters within the Vail, whither the Fore-runner hath gone. But there is nothing of this ſort of Faith, that I can find, as any-wiſe neceſſary or eſſential to the Religion here deſcribed in this Treatiſe of *W. P.* but pure Deiſm, and at beſt refined Paganiſm all along, as will further appear in what follows.

I find in Page 50 of the ſame Treatiſe, a quite differing Definition of Faith, which if not plainly contradictory to the former, is very diſingenuous and full of Equivocation; but whatever way it be taken, if he adhere to it, and allow it to be a proper Definition, (where the Definition it ſelf, in the parts of it, ought to be eſſential to the thing defined, and ſuch as the thing defined cannot be without,) it yields a ſufficient Argument, againſt his Poſition, *That the Light in every Man's Conſcience is the Rule of Faith.* His Definition is this, *Faith is yielding up to the requirings of God's Spirit in us, in full aſſurance of the Remiſſion of Sins that are paſt, through the Son of his love and Life everlaſting.* Several things are faulty in this Definition: Firſt, That he confounds the Effect, or Concomitant of Faith, with Faith it ſelf; for the

the yielding up, or Resignation to God's Requirings, is rather an Effect or Concomitant of Faith, than Faith it self, especially in the present case, as it hath respect to the Rule which determines what is to be believed, or assented unto, upon the Credit of Divine Authority. Secondly, That he makes Remission of Sins to be antecedent and prior to Faith, which is the Error of the *Antinomians*, and plainly contradictory to the Scripture, that holds forth both Repentance and Faith, to be necessary Requisites, in order to Forgiveness. Thirdly, That he makes full Assurance of Remission of Sins to be of the Nature of Faith, whereas there is a Faith of Adhesion, that is, true Faith, that many of the Faithful have, who have not arrived to that full Assurance. But that which I principally notifie in this his last Definition, is, That he makes this full Assurance of the Remission of Sins, to be through the Son of God's love. Where, that the Equivocation and Fallacy may be discovered, I ask him, what he means by the Son of his Love, through which this Assurance of Remission of Sins is obtained; If he means by the Son of his Love, only the Light within every Man's Conscience, it is a palpable Equivocation, and inserted on purpose to deceive the Christian Readers, who generally by Mens having Remission of Sins through the

the Son of God's Love, do underſtand the Son of God's Love to be the Word Incarnate, to wit, Jeſus Chriſt God-man, as he died for our Sins, by his Death to purchaſe to us the Pardon of them. But this ſenſe of the words, which is the true Scripture ſenſe, and the ſenſe of all true Chriſtians, *W. P.* doth not admit, if he adhere to what he hath ſaid, both here and in his other Books; for in his *Serious Apology*, Page 146. he ſaith, in behalf of himſelf and Brethren, *That that outward Perſon that ſuffered at* Jeruſalem, *was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny.* And here in this Book, he makes it not any of the abſolute Neceſſaries, in Religion, but ſome conſiderable Matters ſuperadded, P. 44. *That God was manifeſted extraordinarily in the Fleſh, that he gave his Life for the World; that ſuch as believe and obey his Grace in their Hearts, receive Remiſſion of Sins, and Life everlaſting.* But which way ſoever he underſtands theſe words, *The Son of God's Love*, ſeeing he makes the Rule of every Man's Faith, not to be the Words of God, declaring his Promiſe of Forgiveneſs, as outwardly delivered in the Holy Scriptures; but the Light in every Man's Conſcience; he is bound to give us ſome better proof than his ſimple Affirmation, That the Light in every Man's Conſcience, or indeed in any Man's Conſcience, reveals to him

God's Will to forgive Sins, without all ſpecial Revelation or Declaration of God's Will, as contained in the Holy Scriptures, ſeeing the Holy Scriptures do hold it forth, as one of the great Secrets and Myſteries of God's Will declared to Men, by the ſpecial Revelation of the Holy Spirit, through his Holy Prophets and Apoſtles, even Remiſſion of Sin, and Free Juſtification, by Jeſus Chriſt, through Faith in him, and not by any Works, or Obedience, that either the Jew did perform to the outward Law, or the Gentile did perform to the Law writ in the Heart. When *Peter* preached Remiſſion of Sin, by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, whom the Jews hang'd on the Tree, to *Cornelius*, he confirm'd this Doctrine, not from the eternal Precepts in every Man's Conſcience, or the common Dictates of the Light in every Man, but from the general Teſtimony of the Prophets, *Acts* 10. 43. *To him* (ſaid *Peter*) *give all the Prophets witneſs, that through his name, whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall receive Remiſſion of Sins.* But according to *W. P*'s Doctrine, the Apoſtle *Peter* ſhould have ſaid, To him the Light in every Conſcience, gave the Dictates of that Light in every Conſcience witneſs, That whoſoever gave up to the Requirings of the Light in them, [without all Faith in Chriſt God-man without them] ſhall receive the Remiſſion of their Sins. And

ſeeing

ſeeing whatever is the Rule of Faith muſt teach us, all that is needful to Salvation, by it ſelf, as *W. P.* argueth, he muſt prove that the Light in every Man's Conſcience, dictateth to him this Propoſition, *That if thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth, the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thine heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved*, Rom. 10. 9. Or if it doth dictate ſome other way than this, then that and the like places of Scripture, contradict the Dictates of the Light within. But that this Propoſition laid down *Rom.* 10. 9. is no Dictate of the Light within in Mens Conſciences, is evident from *W. P.*'s plain Confeſſion, P. 32, 33. who ſaith, *That the Light within ſhould tell us, that Chriſt ſuffered Death and roſe again is not needed, inaſmuch as an account of that is extant in Scripture.* Whereby it plainly appears, he holds it not needful to our Salvation, to believe that Propoſition *Rom.* 10. 9. ſeeing the Light within, that is the Rule of Faith, doth not reveal it, and ſuch Revelation is not neceſſary; and conſequently according to him, the belief of that Propoſition, *Rom* 10. 9. is not neceſſary to any for Salvation. And if that be not neceſſary, by the ſame method of Argument (according to *W. P.*) nor is the belief of all the other parts of Scripture neceſſary to Salvation, which are not the common Dictates of the Light in every Con-

ſcience. The only uſe of the whole Scripture, according to *W. P.* is meerly Hiſtorical, which though perhaps true, is nowiſe neceſſary to our Salvation to believe the truth of it; but we are left at liberty, to believe or disbelieve all and every part of what is contained in the Scripture, without any danger to our Salvation; excepting theſe few abſolute neceſſaries, that the Light within every Conſcience teacheth us, as well as the Scriptures. But none of all the twelve Articles of the Apoſtle's Creed, according to the true Senſe of Scripture, or the common received Senſe of all true Chriſtians, are taught by the Light within, without the external Revelation of the Scripture; therefore according to *W. P.* the belief of none of theſe twelve Articles is neceſſary to our Salvation. The which being the plain Import of *W. P's* Doctrine laid down in his Book, whither it be not *Plain Deiſm* appearing with open face, I appeal to all ſincere Chriſtians.

Sect.

## Section 2.

### *His Arguments from Scripture, that the Light in every Man's Conſcience, is the Rule of Faith and Life, Anſwered.*

HE begins with his Proofs, Page 4. *That the Light in every Man's Conſcience, is the general Rule of Faith and Life,* from *Matt.* 11. 27. and 1 *Cor.* 2. 11. he argues, *That becauſe the Father cannot be known, but by the Revelation of the Son, and Holy Spirit, conſequently that Light, mentioned* John 1. 3. *or Spirit, muſt have been the general Rule of Mans Knowledge, Faith and Obedience, with reſpect to God.*

*Anſw.* His Conſequence is denied, he gives no proof of it; yea it is manifeſtly falſe; and to diſcover its Fallacy, obſerve how he confounds the efficient Cauſe, and Author of Knowledge and Faith, with the Rule, which he ought to diſtinguiſh: He might as well argue, no Man ſees what hour it is on a Sun-dyal, but by the Sun, and conſequently the Sun, and not the Dyal, is the Rule whereby he knows the hour.

Page 5. His next Argument is, from *Eph.* 5. 13. *Whatever makes manifeſt is Light, therefore the Light in the Conſcience is the general Rule.*

*Answ.* The Consequence again is denied, it has the same defect as the former, as will appear by forming the like Argument, *Whatever makes manifest an outward object to our Eye, is some outward light of Sun, Moon, or Candle*, &c. Therefore that alone, without the object manifests it, and also without the Organ of sight, who sees not the Fallacy of this Argument, and as much he may see the Fallacy of the other.

The next place of Scripture he argueth from, is *Rom.* 1. 19. which he falsly quotes, as I have observed, he hath misquoted this place, both here and in *pag.* 21, for thus he quotes it. *WHATEVER* might be known of God, was made manifest within, for God who is Light hath shewn it unto them. But let the place it self be considered, and it saith not, *WHATEVER*, but what is to be known of God is manifest in them; to wit, the Gentiles or Heathen Nations, who had not the peculiar Doctrines of the Christian Faith revealed to them, or Preached among them. And that the words, *what is to be known of God*, cannot be meant of *WHATEVER* can or is to be known of God *was manifest in them*; as the Text doth not say it, so it is a manifest Falshood: It cannot be said of the best Christians, that whatever is to be known of God, is made manifest in them; for the best know

but

but in part, and there is ſtill more to be known of God, even in the beſt of Chriſtians, than what is at preſent revealed, or made manifeſt in them. And it is very evident from the following words, what *Paul* meant by that ſaying, *What is to be known of God*; or as it is in the Greek, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. *viz.* The Eternal power and God-Head, which was made manifeſt, partly by the things made or created without Men, and partly by ſome Divine Illumination within them. But doth it therefore follow, that becauſe thoſe Heathens had ſome knowledge of the Eternal Power and God-head, that therefore they knew all the fundamental Principles of the Chriſtian Religion? By no means, more than it followeth, that *W. P.* knoweth ſome things of *England*, and ſome other Countries, partly by Hiſtory, and partly by his ſight of them, therefore he knows the whole Earth, ſo far as it is habitable.

He brings another Proof, *That the Light in every Man's Conſcience is the Rule of Faith and Life*, from *Micah* 6. 8. He hath ſhewed unto thee, O Man, what is good, and what God requireth of thee, &c. *Which* (ſaith he) *could not be, without the Light of his Son ſhines in Man's Conſcience; therefore the light of Chriſt in the Conſcience, muſt needs have been the General Rule*, &c.

*Answ.* His Consequence is again denied, which he doth not prove, it has the same defect with his foregoing proofs, that he confounds the Author, and Efficient cause of Faith, with the Rule, which is the instrumental Cause thereof. But let it be further considered, what the following words are, not mentioned by *W. P.* here, and let them be compared with the foregoing words, Ver. 7. *Will the Lord be pleased with Thousands of Rams, or with ten Thousands of Rivers of Oyl? shall I give my first born for my transgression, the Fruit of my Body for the Sin of my Soul?* Ver. 8. *He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and love Mercy, and walk humbly with thy God?* And it will appear, that the words at least have a ComparativeSense, as intimating that Justice, Mercy and Humility, or Humble walking with God, are more acceptable to God, and the greater things of God's Laws, than all outward Sacrifices were. But doth it therefore follow, that God did not require those outward Sacrifices then to be offered up, or that God did not require Faith in the People of *Israel*, that he did Command them? And if such a Faith was then required of them, which the common dictates of the light in every Conscience did not teach them but *special Revelation*; by the

the like reaſon, it can be proved, that the Faith of Chriſt the great Sacrifice, as he was outwardly to be offered up, of which all the outward Sacrifices were Types, was alſo required by the Lord from that People, the which Faith, all the faithful then had, and by which Faith, they received the remiſſion of their Sins according to *Acts* 10 43. But ſeeing the Light within every Man gives them not this Faith, nor teacheth it them, it evidently follows, that the Light within every Man is not the Rule of the Chriſtian Faith; it may be further ſaid, that the words *Micah* 6. 8, 9. if they were to be underſtood, with reſpect to meer Heathens and Gentiles, who have not the External Word, might imply, that no more is required of them, than thoſe general things which the Law or Light in them doth teach them, and is the only Rule they have; but theſe words ſeem not to be ſpoke with reſpect to meer Gentiles, but rather to them that were by Profeſſion the Church of God; and though neither Faith nor Repentance, nor many other Evangelical Virtues and Duties are there expreſſed, yet without doubt they are implyed, as well as where Faith is only expreſt, in many places of Scripture, Love and other Virtues are implyed. And indeed by the like Fallacy *W. P.* might infer, that our whole Religion conſiſts in practiſeing the

Duties

Duties of the 2d. Table from *James*'s words, *Pure and undefiled Religion is to visit the Fatherless and the Widow, and to keep unspotted from the World.* And that Consequently he that doth this, though he practise none of the Duties of the First Table, he has Religion enough, yea though he have no Faith in God, no fear of him nor Love to him, if he be Charitable, and temperate, as it has been reported some Atheists have been.

*Page* 5. His next Argument is, *It was by this Law, that* Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchisideck, Abimelech, Job, Jethro, *&c. walked, and were accepted as Just by Faith* Ireneus *and* Tertullian, *they were Just, by the Law written in their Hearts, then was it their Rule too, and in that Just State*

*Answ.* This Argument hath several defects in it. 1. To argue from a Law or Rule of Moral Justice, to a Law or Rule of Faith in Christ the promised *Messiah*, without which Faith there is no promise of Eternal Life and Salvation in all the Scripture. Secondly, That he Jumbleth *Abimelech* and *Jethro*, (none of which were prophets) with *Abraham*, and others that were Prophets, and had extraordinary Revelation, concerning the *Messiah*. Thirdly, That he makes no distinction betwixt what the Light or Word did reveal commonly in all Men, by the common Illumination, and what

what that ſame word did reveal to the Prophets, and by them to the Faithful, by ſpecial Revelation and Illumination. And indeed all his Arguments are in great part built on this Fallacy, of not diſtinguiſhing, but confounding the common or general Illuminations, given to all Men, from the ſpecial and extraordinary given to ſome. That the common Illumination of the Divine Word, was to the Patriarchs, *Abraham*, *Noah*, &c. a Law, or Rule of Juſtice is granted; but that it was to them a Law, or Rule of Faith, whereby they believed in the promiſed *Meſſiah*, is denied, for that was a ſpecial Revelation, that was the Law or Rule of that Faith, and not the common Illumination, though both common and ſpecial, were and are from the ſame Divine Word; yet this hinders not their Diſtinction; as all the Creatures of God have one Creator and Author of their Being; yet this hinders not, but that the Creatures are widely diſtinct one from another.

Section

## Section 3.

### *His first and second Arguments, that the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith and Life, Answered.*

Page 5. IN the next place he pleads, that the Scriptures cannot be the Rule, arguing thus, Arg. 1. *How can they be the general Rule, that have not been general.*

*Answ.* He is still guilty of confounding and jumbling things that ought to be distinguished. 1. None saith, that the Scriptures are a general Rule: If by a general Rule, he means a Rule actually obliging all Men whomsoever, for the Scripture obligeth none but such, who either have them, or at least can by some possible means have them. 2. It is granted, that the Law or Illumination that is in all Men, is the general Law, or Rule of Justice and Morality to all Men. But what then, will it follow, that Christians have no other Rule, but that of moral Justice? 3. He ought to have distinguished, betwixt the general Law, or Rule of Justice given to all Mankind, and the general superadded Law, and Rule of Christian Faith and Practise, given in general to Christians; but for want of this distinction, he deceives himself,

ſelf, and ſeeks to deceive others, with fallacious Arguments.

Page 6. He brings an Objection thus, *But granting that the Light within were ſo,* [viz. the general Rule] *before Scripture was extant, yet,* &c. *Anſw.* He ſuppoſeth that to be granted, which ought not to be granted, viz. *That the common Illumination before Scripture was extant, was the Rule of the Faith of all the Faithful, who lived and died in the Faith of the promiſed* Meſſiah, *by whom they believed to have Remiſſion of Sin and eternal Life.* This is altogether denied, for this Faith they had not by the common Illumination, but by ſpecial Revelation given to ſome by Propheſie, and to others by means of their Propheſies.

Page 6. His Quotations out of Gentile Authors, as *Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates,* &c. prove no more at moſt, but that they acknowledged an inward Law, Rule and Principle, of Juſtice and moral Virtue placed in Mankind: But what ſaith all this, to prove that all Mankind had, or have, a Law or Rule of the Chriſtian Faith? Nothing at all.

Page 8. Arg. 2. He makes a freſh Aſſault, to prove that the Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith and Life, &c. His Argument is this, *If* now *the Rule, then ever the Rule; but they were not ever the Rule, therefore they*

*cannot*

*cannot* now *be the Rule. That they were not ever the Rule, is granted. That they are not therefore now the Rule, I ſhall prove* (ſaith he) *thus: If the Faith of God's People, in all Ages, be of* one Nature, *then the Rule but of one Nature: But clear it is,* Heb. 11. *the Faith has been but of one Nature, conſequently the Rule but of one Nature. In ſhort, If the Holy Ancients had Faith, before they had or wrote Scripture, they had a Rule, before they had or wrote Scripture.*

*Anſw.* His whole way of arguing here, is extreamly weak, to detect which, let him conſider, when it is commonly ſaid, the Scriptures are the Rule of Faith, it is not meant ſimply and barely the written Letter, but the Doctrine delivered in or by the written Letter, is the Rule, which at other times is thus expreſſed, the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, or the revealed Will and Mind of God, delivered to us by Scripture, is the Rule of Chriſtian Faith, *&c.* And ſeeing the Doctrine of Faith in the promiſed *Meſſiah*, and of eternal Salvation, through Faith in him, is the ſame, in the Eſſentials and Fundamentals of it, now as then, and then as now without any ſubſtantial Variation; it is evident, that as the Doctrine now committed to writing, is the ſame it was before it was in writing, the Rule is ſtill the ſame, and

and the Faith is the ſame, for Subſtance and Nature; for the different manner of conveying the Doctrine, makes no eſſential Difference, either in the Doctrine, or Faith, and conſequently nor a different Rule. As when the Doctrine is delivered by Preaching or Writing, to one Nation in one Language, and to other Nations in other Languages; yet the Doctrine may be ſtill the ſame: Nor doth it change the Nature of the Doctrine, that ſome had it by Prophetical Inſpiration and Revelation, without any external Mediums; and others had it by and through ſome external Mediums, as by means of the Miniſtry of Faithful Men faithfully conveyed, through the ſeveral Ages, the Spirit of God inwardly by his ſecret Inſpiration, moving the Faithful to believe the Doctrine preached to them by ſuch Faithful Men. And here I would have him to conſider his great default, in not diſtinguiſhing the Inſpirations of God's Spirit, the want of which leads him into ſo many By-paths, as if all Divine Inſpirations were Prophetical, and of the ſame Nature, with what the Prophets and Apoſtles had, as Prophets and Apoſtles; whereas the Scripture plainly diſtinguiſheth the various Gifts, Operations, and Miniſtrations, of one and the ſame God, Lord and Spirit; all which may be accounted Divine Inſpirations: *Are all*

*Prophets?*

*cannot* now *be the Rule. That they were not ever the Rule, is granted. That they are not therefore now the Rule, I ſhall prove* (ſaith he) *thus: If the Faith of God's People, in all Ages, be of* one Nature, *then the Rule but of one Nature: But clear it is,* Heb. 11. *the Faith has been but of one Nature, conſequently the Rule but of one Nature. In ſhort, If the Holy Ancients had Faith, before they had or wrote Scripture, they had a Rule, before they had or wrote Scripture.*

*Anſw.* His whole way of arguing here, is extreamly weak, to detect which, let him conſider, when it is commonly ſaid, the Scriptures are the Rule of Faith, it is not meant ſimply and barely the written Letter, but the Doctrine delivered in or by the written Letter, is the Rule, which at other times is thus expreſſed, the Word of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, or the revealed Will and Mind of God, delivered to us by Scripture, is the Rule of Chriſtian Faith, *&c.* And ſeeing the Doctrine of Faith in the promiſed *Meſſiah*, and of eternal Salvation, through Faith in him, is the ſame, in the Eſſentials and Fundamentals of it, now as then, and then as now without any ſubſtantial Variation; it is evident, that as the Doctrine now committed to writing, is the ſame it was before it was in writing, the Rule is ſtill the ſame,

and

and the Faith is the ſame, for Subſtance and Nature; for the different manner of conveying the Doctrine, makes no eſſential Difference, either in the Doctrine, or Faith, and conſequently nor a different Rule. As when the Doctrine is delivered by Preaching or Writing, to one Nation in one Language, and to other Nations in other Languages; yet the Doctrine may be ſtill the ſame: Nor doth it change the Nature of the Doctrine, that ſome had it by Prophetical Inſpiration and Revelation, without any external Mediums; and others had it by and through ſome external Mediums, as by means of the Miniſtry of Faithful Men faithfully conveyed, through the ſeveral Ages, the Spirit of God inwardly by his ſecret Inſpiration, moving the Faithful to believe the Doctrine preached to them by ſuch Faithful Men. And here I would have him to conſider his great default, in not diſtinguiſhing the Inſpirations of God's Spirit, the want of which leads him into ſo many By-paths, as if all Divine Inſpirations were Prophetical, and of the ſame Nature, with what the Prophets and Apoſtles had, as Prophets and Apoſtles; whereas the Scripture plainly diſtinguiſheth the various Gifts, Operations, and Miniſtrations, of one and the ſame God, Lord and Spirit; all which may be accounted Divine Inſpirations: *Are all*

*Prophets?*

*Prophets?* ſaid *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 29. intimating they were not all Prophets, who yet were true Saints and Believers, all which had the ſame Spirit inſpiring them all, but not the ſame manner and kind of Inſpirations, but far differing; the Prophetical Inſpirations taught them the Doctrine of Faith without all outward teaching of Men; but the Inſpirations of other Faithful Men, who were not Prophets, did teach them the ſame Doctrines, by means of outward teaching of Men.

---

## Section 4.

### *His third, fourth and fifth Arguments, Anſwered.*

Page 9. Arg. 3 HE frames a new Argument here, which he ſets out in a two-fold Dreſs; I ſhall produce it in its beſt Dreſs; and thus it is, *Such as the Faith is, ſuch muſt the Rule be; but the Faith is (as before) Inward and Spiritual, therefore the Rule muſt be Inward and Spiritual, which no meer Book can be.*

*Anſw.* Here he takes his Conſequence as granted, without any offer of proof; but it is altogether Fallacious: If by the term

*Such,*

*Such*, he mean ſuch every way, and in all reſpects, and Univerſally ſuch, it will Infer the greateſt Blaſphemy, (*ad Hominem*) as to argue thus, *Such as the Faith is, ſuch muſt the Rule be*; but the Faith is an Act, or thing that had a beginning in Time, therefore the Rule is an Act or thing that had a beginning in time; and that Rule, according to him, being the Word and Spirit of God, which is God, therefore God (*Abſit Blaſphemia*) had a beginning in time. If by the term *Such*, he mean not ſuch univerſally, but only in ſome reſpects, as becauſe the Faith is true and certain, therefore the Rule is ſuch, his propoſition is granted, but then the Conſequence would not follow, that becauſe the Faith is inward, the Rule is only inward, no more than it will follow, that becauſe my ſight of an object, is in my Eye, that therefore the Object is no where but in my Eye. He grants, that until the Son came, the Law outward was a Rule, *pag.* 19. and yet all thoſe Holy Ancients who lived before the Son came, had the true inward Faith, therefore they had the true inward Rule, and not the outward Rule, by his Argument, which deſtroyeth his former Argument. His Syllogiſm Tranſgreſſeth a certain Rule in Logick, *The major Propoſition in the firſt Figure, muſt not be particular.*

*Page.* 8. 9. As to his Authorities and Teſti-

monies, out of *Justin Martyr*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, to prove that the Word and Spirit is the only Rule of Faith, that *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* were Christians as living with Christ the Word. It may be supposed that *Justin Martyr* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, might thhink that they had Faith in the promised *Messiah*, as *Abraham*, had, nor hath *W. P.* proved the contrary; and if they had that Faith, the Rule of that Faith was the same as to us, to wit, the Doctrine of Faith, which is still the same, whither given by prophetical Inspiration, or by an outward Ministry. His Quotation out of *Eusebius*, affirming that *Abraham*, and the Ancient Fathers were Christians, and his defining a Christian to be one, *that by the knowledge and Doctrine of Christ excels in Moderation of Mind, in Righteousness and Continency of Life*, &c. has not the least weight to confirm *W. P's.* most false Doctrine, *viz.* That Deism and Christianity are but one and the same thing, and have but one and the same Rule, to wit, the Light as with respect to the common Illumination; for *Eubseius* in the definition of a Christian, makes the Doctrine of Christ that whereby he excels in those Vertues. But can *W. P.* prove, that the Doctrine of Faith in Christ, as God-man, for remission of Sin, and Eternal Salvation, was no part

of

of the Doctrine of Christ, according to *Eusebius*'s Sense.

*Page* 9. *Arg.* 5. He proceeds to a new Argument, against the Scriptures being the Rule. *If the Scriptures were the general Rule, they must have always been a perfect Rule, ever since they were a Rule, but this* (saith he) *is impossible, since they were many hundred years in Writing, and are now imperfect also as to number. How then are they the perfect Rule? And if imperfect* (saith he) *How can they be the Rule of Faith, since the Rule of Faith must be perfect?*

*Answ.* This Argument surely is very imfect, as well as offensive, so openly to charge the holy Scriptures with imperfection. Is the common discovery by the Light within given to all Mankind, a perfect discovery of all things necessary, given to all at once? He grants, *It is not, comparing the Light within to a School-master, that first teacheth the Children to Spell, before he teach them to Read,* Chr. Quak *Page* 18. what if all or much that was either spoke or writ by prophetical Inspiration, was not at first extant, this doth no more argue, that the Scriptures are imperfect, than that it argueth, that because our blessed Lord from the dimensions of a Child increased to the dimensions of a Man; that therefore he was imperfect when a Child, whereas a Child and a Man have the same essential perfections:

And in like manner, the Doctrine of the Christian Faith, concerning the remission of Sin, and Eternal Salvation, by the promised *Messiah*, was the same, and had the same essential perfections from the beginning of the World, and in all Ages, as it has now. And one Tenth part, yea perhaps much less than one Hundred part of the Writings of the Holy Scriptures, do perfectly contain all the essential parts of the Christian Doctrine, which yet makes not the other parts superfluous. I would fain know, if God Almighty had given to *W. P.* but an Estate of one hundred a Year, might not that without more have been a full enough provision for him; doth it therefore follow, that the other Hundreds he hath beside, are superfluous?

*Besides*, If not only, the number of the *Books* of the Holy Scriptures is increased, beyond what it was at first, and for many Ages after, but that divers very profitable Doctrines have been super-added, to the fundamental, and some new Commandments given by God Almighty to latter Ages, that were not at first given. Doth this argue any imperfection in the Commands of God? *But* that new Commands were given, to some in one Age, that were not given to others in former Ages, *W. P.* I think cannot deny, yea that to *Abraham*, the Com-

Commandment of Circumciſion was given, in the Ninety Ninth Year of his Age, the Scripture Teſtimony is plain; Doth it therefore follow, that the Commands formerly given him, or the Promiſes, or his Faith before that time was lame and imperfect? If adding new Commands by God himſelf, to what was formerly given by him, doth not make the body of God's Commandments imperfect, nor doth adding to the Rule of Faith, by Divine Authority, make the Rule as firſt given imperfect: Yea *W. P.* grants, page 2. *That though Men in all Ages had ſome knowledge of God, yet not upon equal diſcovery.* And in his *Chriſtian Quaker*, page 18. *Things are neceſſary in reference to their proper times, that may be requiſite to morrow, which is not to day.* If then all Men have not the ſame diſcovery, they have not the ſame general Rule.

---

## Section 5.

### *His ſixth Argument, taken from the Imperfection of the Scriptures, Anſwered.*

IT is greatly worth our noticeing, after that *W. P.* hath argued againſt the Scriptures being the Rule, becauſe they were not

all given at once, but at ſundry times, whence he infers their Imperfections, and conſequently that they are not the Rule of Faith and Life. Yet in Page 22, he makes the new Creature, or new Creation, to be the Rule, and on the Margent quoting, *Gal.*6. 16. *As many as walk according to this Rule, or in this Rule,* τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ; and *Phil.* 3. 16. he ſaith it muſt be underſtood, *Let us walk in the ſame Attainment*; and he ſaith, *The Rule mentioned* Phil. 3. 16. *is ſpoken of the Meaſure of Attainment.* Pray conſider how his Argument here, for the new Creature and Meaſure of Attainment, being the Rule of Faith and Life, quite overthroweth his Argument, againſt the Scriptures being the Rule, becauſe as he ſuggeſteth, they are imperfect, they were not all given at once.

That one Age of Chriſtianity ſhould have one Rule, and another Age another Rule, he makes it very abſurd, p. 24. But is the Meaſure of Attainment the ſame in all Chriſtians, and in all Ages? I ſuppoſe he will ſay nay; then by his own Argument, the leſſer Attainment in ſome Ages and Perſons is imperfect, and therefore cannot be the Rule of Faith. And will he ſay, the new Creature has the ſame Stature in all Chriſtians? Or will or can he ſay, That the new Creature is ſo perfect in him, that nothing is to be added to it? If nay, then by his own Argument

gument it is imperfect, and therefore not the Rule. And whereas he quotes *Druſius* on the Margent, to prove from *Gal.* 5. 6. that Faith that works by love is the Rule, that is according to him, Faith is its own Rule, for the ſubject of his Diſcourſe is, What the Rule of Faith is, which one time he makes to *be Faith it ſelf*, p. 22. another time Chriſt himſelf, and the Spirit; a third time neither this nor that, *but the Teſtimony of the Spirit, Internal Revelation and Inſpiration, the eternal Precepts of the Spirit in Mens Conſciences*, there repeated and declared, p. 25. But again, How can the new Creature be the *General Rule*, ſeeing all Men have it not who have the Scriptures? If becauſe the Scriptures are not general, they are not the Rule, as *W. P.* argueth, by the like reaſon the new Creature is not the Rule, becauſe not general, and conſequently by his way of reaſoning, all unregenerated Perſons have no Rule at all. But if unregenerated Perſons have a Rule, who have not the new Creature brought forth in them; then by his own way of arguing againſt himſelf, one part of Mankind, to wit, the Regenerated, have one Rule, which is the new Creature; and the other part, to wit, the Unregenerated, which is commonly the greater part, have another; but that, according to him, is abſurd, for then all have not one and the ſame

general Rule, which he contends they ought to have. That there is a general Rule of Moral Honeſty and Juſtice given to all Men, the ſame which *Paul* calls, *The Law writ in the Hearts of the Gentiles*, is granted; but that there is a general Law or Rule of Faith, concerning Salvation by Chriſt Crucified, is denied.

---

## Section 6.

*Whither the new Creature, mentioned* Gal. 6. 16. *is the Rule of Faith: And whither the Doctrine is the Rule to the new Creature, or the new Creature the Rule to the Doctrine; and which is the prior or principal Rule.*

AS touching theſe places of Scripture, quoted by him, touching the Rule, as *Gal.* 6. 16. *Phil.* 3. 16. 2 *Cor.* 10. 13, 15. none of them all ſay, either that the Light within, or the new Creature, is the Rule of Faith and Life; nor doth he give any proof by any true Conſequence that it is. And here by the way, *W. P.* ſhould be put in mind, to prove what he aſſerts by plain Scripture, without Conſequences, which his Brethren commonly allow not of; but when any

any of their Opponents argue with them, by Conſequences, however ſo fair, they will not allow of them: And yet throughout this whole Treatiſe of *W. P.* he brings not one Argument from expreſs Scripture to prove his Matter, but proceeds all along by Conſequences, not one of which is fairly and truly inferred, as will appear in the thorough Examination of them. The Rule mentioned *Gal. 6. 6.* hath a plain and eaſie reference to the Propoſition laid down by the Apoſtle in the foregoing Verſe, which is this, *That in Chriſt Jeſus, neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion, but a new Creature.* This Propoſition laid down by the Apoſtle, in ſo many expreſs words, is an excellent Rule, and one of the many excellent Rules appertaining to the Chriſtian Religion, the intire body of which Rules, is deſervedly called the Rule; and well might the Apoſtle ſay, *As many as walk according to that one Rule*, which is very comprehenſive, *Peace be upon them*; for he that duly walks according to that Rule, will be careful to walk according to all the other Rules appertaining to the Chriſtian Religion, whereof that one is a main. But let it be granted, that in ſome ſenſe, the new Creature may be allowed to be a Rule (as I ſee no hurt to allow it in ſome ſenſe) and a Law to him, or them in whom this new Creature is wrought, or brought

brought forth; for even thoſe *Gentiles*, which did the things contained in the Law, are ſaid by *Paul*, Rom. 2. *to be a Law to themſelves: Which did ſhew the Work of the Law writ in their Hearts*: Then ſurely much rather every regenerate Perſon, by reaſon of his new Nature, may be ſaid to be a Law or Rule to himſelf, according to that ſaying of *Boetius* de Conſol. Phil. *Quis legem det amantibus? Major lex amor eſt ipſe ſibi.* The love of Virtue is greater than any Law that can be expreſſed or laid down in words. But how? as Law there is underſtood not properly, a Law or Precept informing the Underſtanding, but Metaphorically, as it is an inward power, having a mighty impulſe upon the Will of a good Man; even as the love of Vice is a mighty Law, that acts with a mighty impulſe on the Will of a bad and vicious Man: Hence as the one may be underſtood to be (even in the Scripture ſenſe) the Law of the Spirit of Life in Chriſt Jeſus, ſo the other may be underſtood to be the Law of Sin and Death, *LAW* in both theſe reſpects being underſtood not properly but Metaphorically, as when we commonly ſay, God Almighty the great Author and Creator of Nature, hath given a Law to the Nature of every thing, as weight to Stones and Metals, whereby they are moved downwards, and levity to Fire, whereby it is moved upwards;

wards; but whither theſe Motions proceed from an inward or external Cauſe in theſe natural bodies, is not the proper matter of Debate here, only the inſtance is given to ſhew, that *LAW* hath commonly a Metaphorical Senſe as well as proper, and ſo hath the word or term Rule. And I ſuppoſe *W. P.* though perhaps not much acquainted with School-diſtinctions, hath heard of the diſtinction of a Rule into *Regula regulas*, and *Regula regulata*, i. e. the Rule ruling, and the Rule ruled, at leaſt of the primary and ſecondary Rule; for he hath allowed in this Treatiſe, that the Scriptures may be called a Secondary Rule, at leaſt in ſeveral parts of them. And why may not much rather the new Creature, or work of Sanctification, be called a Secondary Rule; and the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Religion, conſiſting of many excellent Precepts and Promiſes, and other Goſpel Truths, the Primary Rule? Yea, that it is ſo, is evidently proved, becauſe the new Creature it ſelf, to wit, the Work of Regeneration and Sanctification in the Souls of the Faithful, is inſtrumentally wrought by the Form of Doctrine contained in the Holy Scriptures, the Spirit of God, (working by and with the ſaid Form of Doctrine) being the principal Agent and Efficient, according to *Rom.* 6. 17. *Ye have obeyed from the heart, that Form of Doctrine which*

*was*

*was delivered unto you*, or as the better Tranſlation is out of the Greek, *unto or into which ye were delivered*, the word tranſlated *Form* is *Type*, ſignifying Pattern, Mould or Frame, according to the Faſhion of which a thing is made, as when a piece of Clay is formed by the Potter, by the Frame to which it is applied, or Wax receiveth the Impreſſion of the Seal; or a Veſſel of Braſs, Tin, or Silver is framed by the Mould into which it is caſt. Now as the Mould or Pattern, whereby any Veſſel is framed, is prior to the Veſſel, and the ſhape or faſhion of the Veſſel, is poſterior to the Pattern or Exemplar, according to which it is framed, even ſo the new Creature is poſterior to the Form of Doctrine contained in the Holy Scriptures; and this evidently proves, that the Doctrine contained in the Holy Scriptures, being the ſame that was extant in the Church of God, before it was committed to writing, hath the precedency and priority in point of a Rule to the new Creature; ſo that the Doctrine, to wit, the doctrinal Word and Words of God, given by God and Chriſt to the Holy Prophets and Apoſtles, and by them to other Men, who by means thereof are converted, and inwardly renewed, regenerated and ſanctified, through the Operation of the Holy Spirit, as the principal Efficient, is the Rule to the new Creature,

and

and not the new Creature the Rule to the Doctrine: Hence it is that the Word of God, to wit, the doctrinal word, or word of Doctrine, is by a Metaphor called Seed in Scripture, for of Seed, Plants, Trees and Animals are produced. And ſeeing according to Scripture, Faith is wrought by hearing the Word outwardly preached in God's ordinary way, and that Word is the Doctrine of the Chriſtian Religion, given originally by God and Chriſt, to the Prophets and Apoſtles, and by them to us, it evidently follows, that Faith, or the new Creature, is not a Rule to the Doctrine, but the Doctrine is a Rule to the Faith, and conſequently the Doctrine is the primary Rule of Faith and Life, but not that Faith and Life is the primary Rule, or any Rule at all to the Doctrine, even as in natural Generation the Seed is before the Birth and Fruit, ſo is the Doctrine before the Faith, and before the Perſon that is the Believer or Saint, and regenerated Perſon, as ſuch, and before the Church, for the Word and Doctrine doth not depend on the Church, nor is built on the Church, but the Church depends on it, and is built thereupon, *Eph.*2.20. *Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner ſtone*, and great Foundation of both.

Section

## Section 7.

*The Rule of the Chriſtian Faith, muſt be a Doctrine which ſets before our Minds, all the* Credenda, *or things neceſſary to be believed in certain Propoſitions, concerning which, the Mind of Man can give a Judgment, Affirmative or Negative.*

AGain, that the Doctrine is the moſt perfect Rule, being compared with the new Creature or work of Sanctification, is evident, becauſe ſo far a Man is ſaid to be the more ſanctified and redeemed, the more that his Faith, Love, Hope, Humility, Patience, Temperance, Juſtice, and other Virtues, comes up to a Conformity to the precepts of God and Chriſt faithfully declared to us in the Holy Scriptures. And notwithſtanding the high pretentions of ſome among the People called *Quakers* to perfection, yet I appeal to *W. P*'s Conſcience, if he can or dare ſay, or think, that his Sanctity, or Virtues come up to a full Conformity to the Holy precepts delivered in the Holy Scripture. Is his Faith as great, as the Doctrine given us in the Holy Scripture requires it to be? Is his Love as perfect

perfect and compleat? Is his Meekneſs, Patience and Humility, Juſtice, Temperance and Piety equal to the heighth, breadth, depth, and length of all God's Commands, even as outwardly delivered in the Holy Scriptures; I truſt he hath ſo much diſcretion as to ſay nay; then let him not exalt his Sanctity, or Work of the New Creature wrought in him, above the Sanctity of the Holy Doctrine, and precepts of God and Chriſt contained in the Holy Scripture, making his Sanctity, or New Creature in him, ſuperior or primary Rule to the Doctrine; but let the Doctrine have its due place, to be a ſuperior and primary Rule, to his Sanctity, or work of the New Creature wrought in him; let his Faith and Love, and other Virtues (if he hath them) be Ruled by the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and ſubjected thereunto, but let not the Doctrine be ſubjected unto his Faith and Virtues, which are far inferior to the Purity, Spirituality and Holineſs of the Doctrine. *But* if he will ſay, the New Creature in him, is the greateſt, and higheſt, and moſt perfect Rule, whereby to ſquare his Faith and Life, it followeth that he is arrived at the higheſt pitch of Holineſs, for what can be beyond, or above the higheſt and moſt perfect Rule of Sanctity? *But* again, the greateſt Sanctity (that is poſſible) of Men, or Angels, ſimply

ſimply conſidered, could not have given the knowledge of Chriſt's Incarnation, and of our Redemption by him, without a divine Revelation; therefore the Sanctity or New Creature in the Holieſt of Men, could not be to them a Rule of Faith, as touching theſe Myſteries. If he will ſay, there is a higher and more perfect Rule of Sanctity, than the New Creature wrought in him, let him tell us what it is, if not the Doctrine delivered in the Holy Scriptures, the Laws, Precepts and Commandments delivered there. If he ſay the Light within, or Chriſt and the Spirit within, is that higheſt and moſt perfect Rule of Sanctity. To this I anſwer, The Spirit, or Light within, abſtractly conſidered, cannot be properly a Rule; I ſay abſtractly conſidered from the Doctrines and Precepts delivered by the Spirit, whither internally, without any external Medium, or externally by ſome external Meidum. Nothing properly can be a Rule of Chriſtian Faith, as in reſpect of the peculiar Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion, but that Doctrine which ſets before our Minds, certain propoſitions of Truth, to which the Mind can and ought to aſſent from ſufficient Motives of Credibility, which *W.P.* from his own definition of Faith muſt allow. For he defines Faith (*Page* 4.) to be an aſſent of the Mind in ſuch manner to the diſcoveries

diſcoveries made of God thereto, as to reſign up to God, and have dependance on him, as the great Creator and Saviour of his People. [Where Note that he wholly paſſeth by, Chriſt Conſidered, as God-Man, from being concerned in the object of Faith, and ſo his Faith is no other, but the Faith of a meer Deiſt.] Now ſeeing he defines Faith to be an aſſent of the Mind, to certain diſcoveries made of God thereto, *&c.* Theſe diſcoveries muſt be certain propoſitions ſet before the Mind, in ſome form of Words mentally conceived and apprehended; for the Nature of the Mind, or intellect of Man is ſuch, that it cannot Judge what is true or falſe, but as the truth is ſet before it in certain propoſitions conſiſting of Words, at leaſt internally conceived and apprehended; for the aſſent of the Mind, is a Judgment of the Mind formed, whereby it Judgeth this or that to be true; and if it be a true Judgment, it muſt have ſome propoſition conſiſting of words, concerning which it is enabled either to affirm or deny what is really true; as the Mind cannot aſſent to this great truth, *that God is not a Body*, but by a negative propoſition conſiſting of ſome words, which is a negative Judgment; nor can it aſſent to this other propoſition, *that God is a Spirit*, but by an affirmative propoſition, conſiſting of ſome words, at leaſt Internally con-

ceived, [called by some Idea's] which is an affirmative Judgment; and therefore so far as Faith is an act of the intellect, and an assent of the Mind, it must needs have some Words, at least internally proposed to it, whereby it is capable to give an assent to the Truth of what it Judgeth; and seeing in matters purely of Faith, the Mind is not capable of giving an assent to the truth of them, without some sufficient motives of Credibility, as that they are given of God, who is a God of Truth, and cannot lye nor deceive. From these Considerations it is evident, that as there can be no assent of the Mind or intellect without words, or Idea's, so there can be no Faith without them, and consequently that the Rule of Faith must be certain propositions consisting of words and sentences, such as God delivered to the Prophets, and which are recorded in Scriptures, such are, *That the Word was made Flesh*, that *a Virgin should Conceive and Bare a Son, and that Son should be the Saviour of the World; that by his Death he should reconcile us unto God; That he should rise again from the Dead, on the Third Day, and ascend into Heaven; and that he should there remain, appearing in the presence of God for us, our mighty Advocate and Intercessor until he come again, to Judge the Quick and the Dead*, &c. How can the Mind of Man assent

aſſent to theſe great Truths, without words, at leaſt internally conceived; if he cannot, as every intelligent Perſon muſt acknowledge, then thoſe very words, as they lye in a certain ſeries and order of propoſitions, are the Rule of his Faith. But ſeeing theſe words have no ſelf-evidence, but the evidence of the truth of them depends on the veracity of God, the Original Author of them; the next thing to be enquired into is, what is the great and moſt principal motive of Credibility to move, and effectually perſwade the Mind, that they are the Words of God; ſurely he who believes that there is a God, cannot but aſſent to this propoſition, that whatever God hath ſaid is true, that all the Words of God are Words of truth, it hath as immediate evidence to him, that has the leaſt true knowledge of God, *as that the whole is greater than the part.* That then which is only requiſite to move the Mind of Man to aſſent to any words delivered to us, as the words of God, is to have a ſufficient motive of Credibility given us, why we ſhould believe them to be indeed the words of God. That the Prophets and Apoſtles knew, that all the words they delivered to Men, as the words of God, were infallibly the words of God, is generally granted by all that own the Truth of Divine Revelation, the manner of their Conveyance to their

Underſtanding, being with ſuch a Divine Power, Majeſty and Glory, and making ſuch a Divine Impreſſion on them, as infallibly aſſured them; and this many times without all Miracles propoſed to their outward Senſes.

---

## Section 8.

*That the Faithful have as good Aſſurance of the Truth, and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, by the ordinary Inſpirations of the Spirit, in the uſe of the outward Means, as the Prophets had by Extraordinary and Prophetical; The Diſtinction betwixt them, explained.*

THE great Queſtion therefore that remains now to be conſidered and reſolved is, Whither the Faithful cannot have, and actually have not, as good Aſſurance, in reſpect of all Fundamentals and Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Faith at leaſt, that the words delivered by the Holy Prophets and Apoſtles, were the Words of God, as if they had received them in the ſame way and manner, as the Prophets and Apoſtles received them, which was without any external Medium,

dium, ſuch as the Miniſtry of Men and Books, whereas the way that we now receive thoſe words, is by ſome external Medium, to wit, the Miniſtry of Men and Books. I ſhall not here inſiſt upon the external Motives of Credibility, taken either from ſo many Thouſands of the beſt and wiſeſt of Men, in the ſeveral Ages of the World, ſince the words were committed to writing, who have received and embraced them, to be what really they are, even the Words of the Living and True God, or ſuch as are taken from the Words themſelves, as outwardly delivered, ſuch as the Simplicity, Purity, Majeſty and Efficacy of their Doctrine, the Harmony of the ſeveral Parts, the fulfilling of the many Prophecies contained in them, the many other incomparable Excellencies of them, the wonderful Effects they have had on many Thouſands and Millions of Men, in being inſtrumental to their Converſion from Idolatry and Ungodlineſs, to true Piety and Sanctity; all which are of great weight, to convince the Reaſon of Men; but becauſe all this doth amount to no more but a rational Conviction, and doth not beget a Divine Aſſent or Perſwaſion, Therefore I conclude with all Orthodox and Sound Chriſtians, that our full Perſwaſion and Aſſurance of the Infallible Truth, and Divine Authority of them, is from the inward

Work of the Holy Spirit, by his Internal and Supernatural Illumination, Inspiration, and Revelation, and secret and most inward Teaching in our Hearts, by sensible and perceptible Impressions, Sealing to the Truth of them, upon our Hearts and Minds.

And here I think fit to guard against a two-fold Extream, that I find too many run into, both greatly and dangerously erroneous; the one is of some, that grant indeed, that the Spirit doth inwardly operate in the Souls of Men, and more especially in the Souls of the Faithful; but this Operation, or Agency and Efficiency of the Spirit, they will have it only to be effective, and no-wise objective; that is to say, no-wise perceptible, or sensible to the Soul, in which the Spirit doth so operate: Hence it is, that some of them have called this Internal Operation of the Spirit even in the Faithful, *Medium incognitum assentiendi*; the which Assertion being so repugnant to the Scripture Testimonies in many places, that hold forth the Spirits internal Operations and Virtues to be as sensible, upon the internal and spiritual Senses of Souls, in any good degree, inwardly quickned and made alive to God, as the Operations of outward Light, Heat, Cold, or the most affecting Objects of Sight, Taste, Smelling and Feeling, are upon our outward and bodily Senses; and also being

being ſo contrary to the Experience of many Thouſands of true experienced Chriſtians, I ſhall not inſiſt here any further to refute it. The other as dangerous and erroneous Extream is of ſuch, of whom is *W. P.* and his Party, as plainly appears by what he layeth down in this Treatiſe, and oft elſewhere in his Books, who hold, That the Manner and Kind of the Spirits Internal Inſpirations, Revelations, Illuminations, and inward Teachings, is the ſame with that which the Prophets and Apoſtles had; that is to ſay, that whatever (they think) they have a Divine Knowledge and Faith of; the words, which are neceſſary to be the Rule and Medium, to the obtaining this Knowledge and Faith, muſt be given them, as they were given to the Pen-men of the Holy Scriptures, to wit, without the external Medium of the Holy Scriptures, and without any external Teaching whatſoever; and that therefore their Faith and Knowledge, ſo far as it is Divine, hath no dependence on the words delivered in the Holy Scriptures; but whatever they know or believe, by a Divine Knowledge and Faith, it is wholly from words inwardly given them from the Spirit, without all outward conveyance of Men or Books. Hence it is, that *W. P.* calls his and his Brethrens Rule of Faith and Life, the eternal Precepts of the

Spirit in Mens Consciences; but as for the Precepts and Words outwardly delivered in Scripture, they are but to him, what *Pythagoras*, and other Philosophers quoted by him, *Page 6.* judged of other Writings, to wit, liveless Precepts: Hence many of his Party have presumed to call them, *a Dead Letter, Death, and Carnal.* Yet *Page 25.* he is so yielding and seemingly kind to the Scriptures, that he grants them to be a subordinate, secondary and declaratory Rule. *Such a subordinate, secondary and declaratory Rule* (saith he) *we never said, several parts of Scripture were not.* Here observe for all his professed kindness to the Scriptures, he will not allow all the parts of Scripture, but only some parts of it, to be so much as a subordinate, secondary and declaratory Rule: though even the Ceremonial Precepts, he has as great reason to believe them to be the Words of God, and consequently a Rule of Faith, though not of Practise (as touching the external Types) as truly as any other parts of Scripture. But seeing every subordinate and secondary Rule, pre-supposeth a primary Rule, which hath no dependence on the Secondary; though the Secondary is wholly from the Primary, as the Transcript is wholly from the Original; but the Original is intirely compleat and perfect without the Copy or Transcript;

it

it is evident that according to him, he hath all what he thinketh to be a Divine Knowledge and Faith, wholly from his primary Rule, and nothing from the Scriptures, which he calls the Secondary, for the Excellency of the primary Rule is, that it teacheth all that is to be divinely known or believed, without the need or help of any ſecondary Rule, otherwiſe it ſhould not be primary, nor ſhould the Scriptures in that caſe be a ſubordinate Rule but co-ordinate, and of equal Dignity, Neceſſity and Uſe with what he calls the Primary; for whatever is a primary, full, adequate and perfect Rule, ſuch as he will have only the Light within, or by whatever other Name he deſigns it, it muſt propoſe to him all the *Credenda* and *Agenda*, i. e. all things he ought to believe and practiſe, without any other Rule whatſoever: And yet in Contradiction to his own Doctrine he grants, p. 25. *That by and through the Scripture, as ſome Inſtrument, this great and univerſal Rule* (which he will have to be, the living, ſpiritual, immediate, omnipreſent, diſcovering, ordering Spirit of God) *may convey its directions.* Judge Reader, if this be not a Contradiction to his former Doctrine, and a great Impertinency, ſurely as he who hath the Original, has no need of the Copy, nor great uſe of it for himſelf; ſo if *W. P.* have ſuch a perfect compleat

pleat primary Rule that teacheth him, without Scripture, all what he ought to know, believe or practiſe, I cannot underſtand of what great uſe the Scripture can be unto him, or at leaſt it is of no neceſſity to him, this primary Rule hath taught him all before-hand, otherwiſe it is not primary. If it be objected, That the Prophets and Apoſtles had the Spirits inward Teachings, to be their primary Rule, in what they delivered as Prophets and Apoſtles, and yet they made uſe of the Scriptures, ſuch as were penned before them. I anſwer, Becauſe neither the Prophets nor Apoſtles were taught in all things, that they believed and practiſed, by the Spirits inward Teachings, as the primary Rule; but only, in what they ſpoke or writ as Prophets and Apoſtles, in other things which they had not by Prophetical Inſpiration; the Scripture, what was then extant of it, was the primary Rule to them, as well as to others of the Faithful, who were neither Prophets nor Apoſtles.

## Section 9.

*That the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture is the Rule of Faith, which Faith, the Spirit of God, being the principal Efficient, begets and works in the Faithful, by the Doctrine, which is the Inſtrument of the Spirit. That it brings Confuſion, and derogates from the Spirit, to make the Spirit the Rule.*

Arg. 6. ANother of *W. P*'s great Arguments, to prove, that the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith, p. 13. is, *How ſhall I be aſſured* (ſaith he) *that theſe Scriptures came from God. If with the Spirit that gave them forth, which ſearcheth the deep things of God, (a meaſure of which is given to me to profit withal) then it is moſt congruous, to call the Spirit, by way of Excellency, and not the Scriptures, the Rule.*

I anſwer, denying his Conſequence, It is indeed allowed, that it is congruous, for that cauſe, to call the Spirit the principal efficient and moving Cauſe, together with Chriſt, and God the Father; but moſt incongruous, falſe and pernicious, to make him to be the Rule; which is ſo far from giving the due Honour and Excellency to the Spirit,

Spirit, ſo to do, that it derogates from his Honour and Excellency; for it confounds the efficient Cauſe with the Inſtrument, and is as abſurd as to ſay, the Square, or Carpenter's Rule, that the Carpenter works with, that is but of Wood, is the Carpenter himſelf, which is extreamly falſe; it is no derogation from the Spirit, to ſay, that he uſeth the Rule or Inſtrument of his own preparing, whereby to frame and faſhion us, according to his good pleaſure, as the Carpenter uſeth his Square or Rule, to frame his pieces of Wood to put into a Building. And for the better clearing of the matter, a little further, when all Orthodox Chriſtian Writers ſay, that we are aſſured, that the Scriptures came from God, with, or by the Spirit that gave them forth; they mean not, that the Spirits inward Teſtimony or Witneſs to the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, is any new or repeated Teſtimony of the Words and Doctrines of the Scripture, which is not neceſſary, but only by way of putting a Seal on a Deed or Bond, together with the Hand or Subſcription of him that gives the Deed or Bond; which Hand and Seal confirms the Truth of the Bond; yet it doth not tell what the Contents of the Deed or Bond is, nor is it neceſſary it ſhould, the Deed or Bond it ſelf tells the Contents of it. And to uſe the *Schools Diſtinction* a little in the caſe,

caſe, The Doctrines and Words contained in the Holy Scriptures, are the *material object of Faith*, to wit, *quod Creditur*, i e. what is believed; but the Spirits inward Teſtimony, Seal or Impulſe, and Motion, which carrieth in it a peculiar Evidence, that none knoweth, but he who hath it, is the *formal Object of Faith*, to wit, *propter quod Creditur*, that inward Motion and Influence, Impreſſion and Influence of the Spirit, that ſenſibly and perceptibly moveth the Faithful to believe the Truth of the Scriptures, as being the Words of God.

Nor is this Controverſie, about the Rule of Faith and Life, a Logomachy, or ſtrife of words, as ſome may ignorantly ſuppoſe, but a moſt material Caſe, and of moſt dangerous Conſequence, to exclude the Scriptures, which are the great and bleſſed Means that God has appointed us, for begetting true Faith, Knowledge and Obedience in us, through the mighty Operation of the Spirit of God. But if what the Spirit of God hath appointed us to be the Means and Inſtrument of our Knowledge, and Faith, and Practiſe, and the Rule whereby to diſcern Truth from Error, Right from Wrong, with the Spirits internal Illumination, we prove neglectful of it, to wit, of the Holy Scriptures, in the frequent uſe of them, by Reading, Hearing, Meditation and Prayer,

we

we provoke the Holy Spirit to depart from us, and to leave us to our vain imaginations, and Satan's ſuggeſtions and deluſions, to be received by us as Divine Revelations, and Inſpirations, as hath happened to many, to their unſpeakable hurt. Again, as the Spirit, nor yet his Internal Inſpiration, or Illumination, and Revelation, is not the Rule of Faith, but the principal efficient of it, and his Internal Inſpiration, Illumination and Revelation, is the *Objective Medium*, moving the Mind to aſſent to the truth of the Doctrines contained in the Holy Scriptures, but not the *Rule* of Faith, nor the *Material object* of it, ſo nor is the Spirits Internal Illumination, Inſpiration and Revelation, the Rule of *Interpretation* of Scripture, but that which enlightens the underſtanding, and opens the Spiritual Eyes of the Mind to underſtand the Scripture, or ſo much of it at leaſt as contain the fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and beget a Saving, Sanctifying and Savoury knowledge of them, without any other Rule than the Scripture it ſelf; for as when our Eyes are opened, and receive outward Light, to ſee an object, we need no new object, whereby to ſee the Object propoſed, but that our ſight be ſtrengthned, and enlightned; ſo in receiving a Spiritual Underſtanding of Scripture truths, we need

no

no other Rule, either outward or inward, but the Scripture it ſelf; only we need the Spirits inward Illumination, Inſpiration, and Revelation, to aſſiſt and help us to a Saving Underſtanding of them, by way of an objective Medium.

---

## Section 10.

*His ſeventh Argument, againſt the Scripture being the Rule of Faith; from his arguing, That they are obſcure, and have not the Method of a Rule, Anſwered.*

Page 10. Arg. 7. ANother Reaſon he gives, which he calls his Third Reaſon, is, *From the obſcurity of them that they are not plain but to the Spiritual Man; they ſeem not in their own Nature and frame, to have been compiled and deliver'd as the general Rule, and intire Body of Faith, but rather Written upon particular occaſions and emergencies, the Doctrines are ſcattered throughout the Scriptures, inſomuch that thoſe Societies who have given forth verbal Confeſſions of their Faith, have been neceſſitated to toſs them to and fro, ſearch here, and ſearch there, to*

*lay*

*lay down this or the other Principle. Beſides here they are Proper, there Metaphorical; in one place literally, in another Myſtically to be accepted.* And after diverſe other words of Complaint, againſt their being the Rule, he concludes, *Thus* Peter *ſaid of* Paul's *Writings, that in many things they were hard to be underſtood, therefore not ſuch a Rule which ought to be* Plain, Proper and Intelligible.

*Anſw. Reader:* What think'ſt thou of this ſort of Language, in derogation from the Holy Scriptures? What if I ſhould ſay of *W. P*'s, and all his *B*rethrens Writings, what he here ſaith of the Scriptures, That they are neither *Plain, Proper, nor Intelligible*, would he not account that ſaying, a derogation from them? If this be not to preſet the Friends Writings to the Scriptures in theſe Mens eſteem, let the impartial Judge, moſt of which have the advantage above the Scriptures, by his arguing, The Scriptures were Writ upon particular occaſions, but ſome of their *B*ooks at leaſt deſignedly Writ, in the Scriptures, the Doctrines are ſcattered here and there, but in *W. P*'s and *G. W*'s *B*ooks, the Doctrines and Principles are in excellent Order, and lye together. *Paul*'s Writings in many things are hard to be underſtood, and beſide they were originally Writ in *Greek*, which many underſtand not, and we have not the Autographa

grapha, but Copies, and of theſe great variety and difference, as he argueth againſt the certainty of the Scriptures, upon the foundation of all others that are not one with them, in making the Spirit the Rule of Faith. *P.* 23. *But* we have the Autographa, or at leaſt the firſt Printed Copies of *G. W.* and *W. P.* without any variation, or difference in matter; and which is a great advantage, their Writings are the Dictates of the Holy Ghoſt, originally in Engliſh; whereas we have nothing of the Scriptures originally in Engliſh, but the whole is a Tranſlation very imperfect, and differing from other Tranſlations both of Engliſh and other Languages, and which is beſt, the unlearned know not at all, and even the learned many times are not certain; all which give the advantage by very far, to the Writings of the Friends above the Scriptures, upon the ſuppoſition, that they are the immediate Dictates of the Holy Ghoſt, as theſe Men do not ſuppoſe, but poſitively affirm many of them to be; eſpecially ſuch as they ſay, are given forth from the Spirit of Truth. *But* ſuppoſe divers parts of the Scripture were writ upon particular occaſions, and emergencies, as to Men, yet many other parts were writ deſignedly and intentionally for general inſtruction to all the faithful; and theſe ſo writ, contain all the eſſentials and fundamentals

mentals of Christian Faith and Practice, and even these writ upon particular occasions and emergencies seemingly to Men accidental or occasional; yet with respect to God, were designed by him for a general good, without whose wise and all-ruling providence nothing can happen. What seemed more occasional than *Joseph*'s being sold into *Egypt*? yet God Almighty had a glorious design in it, though he was neither the Author nor Approver of their Envy who sold him. But is it any prejudice against the Scriptures being the Rule, that they must be searched, to find out the Doctrines contained in them: Or that some places are hard to be understood, though all the fundamental Doctrines necessary to Salvation, are sufficiently plain, to all the Faithful who are Spiritually enlightned to understand them. Do not the like Objections as much, and rather much more, lye against the Light within all Men, being the Rule of Faith and Life? For excepting the common Principles of Moral Justice and Temperance, all other things relating either to Faith or Life, with respect to the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of the Christian Religion, are not to be found at all, in the Light within every Man, abstractly and by it self considered. Otherwise if *W. P.* think's they are, let him tell me, what one peculiar Doctrine of Christian

Chriſtian Religion, or peculiar Precept of it, diſtinct from Deiſm, or Gentile Religion, has the Light within him taught him? If he ſay, to believe that there is one great God Almighty, that Commands him to be Honeſt, Juſt and Temperate; I ſay, theſe are not peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of Chriſtianity, but common to it with Deiſm. And if he hath no other Principles or Precepts taught him by the Light within, but what every Deiſt, Mahometan or Jew, who are Enemies to the Chriſtian Faith have, then let him ſpeak out yet more plainly, though I think he has ſpoke very plain already: If the Light within him, has taught him any other Principles or Precepts, than what Deiſts, Jews and Mahometans have, let him tell us, that he may convince us, that the Light within every Man is the Rule of Faith, and not the Scriptures without; but let him not only tell us ſo, but give us ſome effectual Reaſon, to convince any rational Man, that the Light within him only has taught him that peculiar Principle and Precept of Chriſtian Religion, without the Scriptures being ſo much as Inſtrumental in his being ſo taught: For all Orthodox Chriſtians, by affirming the Scriptures to be the Rule, they give no more to the Scriptures but to be the Inſtrument of the Spirit, in giving all Saving knowledge and Faith of

Divine Truth, and if he allow them in God's ordinary way, to be the Instrument of the Spirit, in giving him, and us all, the Knowledge of Christian Doctrines and Mysteries peculiar to the Christian Religion, he has all this time been fighting with his own Shadow; for if so, he agrees with them all, from whom he seeks so much to differ, and writ against. That the Spirit of God can reveal in every Man, all necessary Truth, is granted by all Christians; but the Question is not, what he can do, but what he doth, in God's ordinary way of working.

---

## Section 11.

*His eighth Argument answered, That the Scriptures cannot give Faith, therefore they are not the Rule of Faith. And his ninth and tenth Arguments answered.*

Page 11. Arg. 8. HIS fourth Argument, as he numbers them, against the Scriptures being the Rule, is, *Because the Scripture cannot give Faith, therefore it cannot be the Rule of Faith.*

*Anſ.* The Conſequence is denied, and he gives no offer of proof for it; his Argument is

is as weak, as to argue, a Carpenter's Rule or Square cannot build a Houſe, therefore it cannot be a Rule or Inſtrument for him to work by in building a Houſe. This his way of arguing, deſtroyeth all uſe or ſervice of Inſtruments and ſecondary Cauſes; the like Failure hath his arguing againſt the Scriptures being the Rule of Practiſe, Arg. 9. *Becauſe it cannot diſtinguiſh of it ſelf in all Caſes, what ought to be practiſed, and what not.* Well; but what if it cannot of it ſelf, as the Carpenter's Rule cannot of it ſelf meaſure one piece of Wood more than another, without the hand of him that uſeth it; doth it therefore follow, that the Rule cannot do it, when applied by the Hand of the Man himſelf?

Page 12. *This* (ſaith he) *was the Caſe of Chriſt's Diſciples, who had no particular Rule in the Old Teſtament, for the aboliſhing of ſome part of the Old Teſtament Religion; on the contrary they might have pleaded for the perpetuity of it. For inſtance, God gave Circumciſion as a Sign for ever.*

*Anſw.* By his favour he is miſtaken, in ſaying they had no ſuch particular Rule, for the aboliſhing (he ſhould rather have ſaid, expiring of) ſome parts of the Old Teſtament Religion: Let him read *Jer.* 3. 16. and 31. 31, 32. compared with *Heb.* 8. 8 and he may find the contrary, the word *for ever*

in the place mentioned by him, in relation to Circumcision, and other Jewish Types, signified not *to the end of the World*, far less *endlesly*, but for a certain limited time, as the Jews themselves confess at times it so signifies; yea, and some of the most judicious of them have confessed, they were to cease before the end of the World.

In his tenth Argument he but too much gratifies his *Deist Brethren*, and *Profane Atheists* by his bringing their and other Popish Arguments, against the Scriptures being the Rule, *Page* 13. *As that they are not in the Original, because that is not extant, nor in the Copies, because there are Thirty and above in number, and it is undetermined, and for ought we see* (saith he) *indeterminable. And the variety of Readings among those Copies, amount to several Thousands. And if the Copies cannot, how can the Translations* (saith he) *be the Rule?* And so goeth on, disputing against the Translations being the Rule. And then argueth against their being the Rule, *from diverse of the Books of Scripture being rejected by some, and received by others*; all which Pleas both of Deists and Papists, have been abundantly answered by Protestant Writers; see Dr. *Tillotson*'s Book, called, *The Rule of Faith*, in answer to *J. S.* a Papist, whose Arguments against the Scriptures being the Rule of Faith, are so much of the same sort with these

theſe here of *W. P.* as if he had taken them from him. And the *inward Teſtimony* of the Spirit *ſufficiently aſſerted* to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, without taking away from them their due Honour, Uſe and Service, of their being the Rule of Faith and Life, in all things neceſſary to Salvation; which yet *W. P.* labours to rob them of, under a pretence of exalting the Spirit, but really is a degrading and diſhonouring both, as is above proved; beſide the great Miſchief it cauſeth, in caſting all People, who believe *W. P.* and his Party, looſe from the Scriptures, that Satan may have the more advantage over them to deceive them, as he hath wofully done; for if the whole Scripture, and every part of them, be not to them the Rule of Faith, they may chuſe what to believe, and what not to believe; and to believe no more than what the Spirit within (which as it may be, and often is not the Spirit of God) teacheth them to believe; for they may hence infer, ſince the Spirit, that is the primary Rule, teacheth them not to believe any ſuch Doctrines, or Precepts, it is but Spurious and Apocryphal, and no part of the Secondary Rule, as ſometimes they are pleaſed to call it; though the diſtinction of primary and ſecondary Rule will not be found in their firſt Authors, for then the Spirit was the only Rule, and the

only Means, and the Scriptures were Carnal, and the dead Letter, and lifeless Precepts, as *W. P.* seemeth to call them, else why doth he quote *Philo*, and *Pythagoras*, and others, that called all outward Precepts such.

---

## Section 12.

### *His eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth Arguments answered.*

Arg. 11. HIS eighth Argument is, That *the Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith and Life, because they cannot be the Rule in their Translations.* Page 26. *Supposing the ancient Copies were exact, it cannot be the Rule to far the greatest part of Mankind. Indeed* (saith he) *to none but learned Men; which neither answers the Promise relating to Gospel-times, which is universal; nor the Necessity of all Mankind, for a Rule of Faith and Life*

*Anſ.* Why not in their Translations, by the help of the Spirit, as above declared? It may be supposed, that *W. P*'s Learning is not so great, that he needs not the Translation, as well as other Men; it is well known, that the Translations, and all the various Copies and Readings, make not the least Alteration in any of the Fundamental or Essential Doctrines of Christianity; yea, scarcely

ſcarcely in any (much material) whatſoever.

Arg. 12. His ninth Argument is, from thoſe voluminous Diſcourſes of Caſes of Conſcience that are extant among us: *For* (ſaith he) *had the Scriptures been as Sufficient* [Note here his fling at their Sufficiency] *as the Nature of the Rule of Faith and Life requireth, there had been no need of ſuch Tracts.*

*Anſw.* This Argument equally fighteth againſt the Light within being the Rule of Faith and Life, for if it actually doth all that the Nature of a Rule of Faith and Life requireth, then pray, What need had there been of ſo many Tracts of the Quakers Writings about Doctrines and Principles, as well as Caſes of Conſcience, which have amounted to a prodigious Number within theſe Fifty Years, ſeeing all Men have the ſame Light within them, to be the ſame Rule in all: Is not that ſufficient without any of theſe Tracts? If *W. P.* ſay it is becauſe the Authority of the Light within is much gain-ſaid among Men, and the Dictates of it grievouſly perverted and made contradictory; If both Parties, even among the Quakers themſelves, may be believed, *G. F* and his Party, when alive, and now *W. P*'s and *G. W*'s Party, judging that which *John Story* and his Party believed to be the Dictates of the Light within, to be the Dictates of a

Falſe

False Spirit, and they judging the like of them. Therefore Books and Tracts have been multiplied among themselves. And as good and much better reason can be given, why so many truly pious and edifying Tracts have been written by many Godly Men, to vindicate both the Sufficiency of the Spirit, and true Light within, in all the Faithful; and also the Sufficiency of the Scriptures without; this as the Rule, and that as the principal Teacher, Agent, and Efficient, working with and by the Rule, and yet none of the two, how much ever sufficient, excluding the Lord Jesus Christ God-Man without us, from being our All sufficient Saviour, each being sufficient in their own order and manner of acting. As concerning such *Gentiles*, to whom the offer of Faith has not been made, neither by Men nor Writings, none say, that the Scriptures are a Rule to them; but as they have no outward Rule of Christian Faith, so nor doth it appear, that they have the Christian Faith it self; If any have it, they have it not by the common Illumination, but by some miraculous and extraordinary manner, unknown to us. And how God disposeth of the more Sober and Virtuous among them, doth not at all reach the present Controversie, which is not, whither the Scripture be the Rule to all Mankind, that ever lived, or now live, but whither

ther it be the Rule of Faith and Life, to them who have them, or may have them, by ſome poſſible means.

*Page* 16. *Arg* 13. Whereas he ſaith, *Doth not your own Language and Practiſe prove its* (viz. the Scriptures) *Inſufficiency to that end, at what time you both exhort to, and go in ſecret to ſeek the Mind of the Lord in this or that important Affair? Why do not you turn to Chapter and Verſe for ſatisfaction, if the Scripture be appointed of God for the General Rule.*

*Anſ.* This Argument hath alſo as great force, or rather much greater, againſt the Light within being the General Rule; for do none of the Friends both exhort to, and go in ſecret to ſeek the Mind of the Lord, in this or that important Affair? Why do they not turn to the Light within to be forthwith without all Prayer, or waiting, informed and ſatisfied? If they do not, yea, if *W. P.* do not, both he and they are wofully deceived, by neglecting Prayer, and waiting on God, to receive Satisfaction in this or that important Affair; but if they find their need both for Prayer, and waiting for direction, then let him anſwer his own Argument, and make due Application. But to give a poſitive and direct anſwer, if it be either a matter of Doctrine or Precept, that any Chriſtian wants due Inſtruction and Direction in, they may both Pray, and Read, and

and search the Scriptures, and Meditate, lad wait for God's inward Illumination and nspiration, to give them a right Underſtanding, and they may expect it will be given them, if they ſincerely ſeek it, and uſe all due Endeavours and Means to attain it, one of which is, to conſult and uſe the Advice of others, whom they have cauſe to judge, Spiritually, more enlightned than themſelves. If it be in Caſes that are neither matter of Doctrine, nor Precept, but where the matter is by it ſelf indifferent, and neither ſimply commanded nor forbidden, as many ſuch Caſes there are, they may and ought to pray and wait for direction, and it may pleaſe God to give it to them, by ſome ſecret Motion, Impulſe or Impreſſion of his Holy Spirit, which may ſufficiently ſatisfie them, without making that impreſſion, Motion or Impulſe, the Rule of either Faith or Obedience, ſeeing the Matter is neither a Matter of Doctrine nor Precept, wherein either Faith or Obedience, as touching that particular is concerned, but a Motion or Impulſe ſimply from God, upon the Will, cannot be properly called a Rule, becauſe, as is above ſaid, a Rule, properly ſpeaking, is a Form of Words and Propoſitions, either outwardly expreſſed, or inwardly conceived, to which the Intellect either aſſents or diſſents: And if any true

Chriſtian

Chriſtian finds ſuch a motion, or impulſe on his VVill, if after examination he find that it doth not incline him, to any thing either contradictory to Scripture, or true Reaſon, he is in no great danger to yield to it; and if he do not yield to it, upon juſt ſuſpicion or fear, that it is not of God, it will not be charged to be a Sin upon him; for nothing is Sin, but a Tranſgreſſion of God's Law.

Page 19. *The Law outward* (ſaith he) *as a Rule was but as* Moſes, *till the Son came, the Servant abideth not in the Houſe for ever, the Written Law held its place, but till the inward Riſe in more Glory and Brightneſs, or rather, till People became more capable of being turned to it, and living with and in it.*

*Anſw.* Had not Mankind generally the Light within them, under *Moſes*? How comes it then, that it was not the Rule to them, and did not diſmiſs the written Law? But if there be no written nor outward Law given by Chriſt under the Goſpel, then all that he taught outwardly, and for which he ſent his Spirit upon the Apoſtles, to bring it all to their Remembrance, and to move them to commit it to Writing, Yea, the whole New Teſtament Writings muſt be diſmiſſed, and turned out of the Church, the Houſe of God, as was *Iſhmael* and his Mother out of *Abraham*'s Houſe, be-

cauſe

cauſe by his moſt falſe Arguing, the writ' ten Law given by Chriſt, and the Holy-Ghoſt, under the New Teſtament, is as much the Servant, as the Old Covenant was. O the Vanity and Folly of this manner of Arguing, which wholly makes void Chriſt's Prophetical and Kingly Office, as he was outwardly ſent in the Fleſh, by the Father, to give a more full and clear diſcovery of the way of Salvation, as the great Prophet, and to give forth his Royal Laws, to the Church under the New Teſtament, as King and Head thereof!

But he further enlargeth upon this Argument, *P.* 17. telling us, *There are a Thouſand Caſes, in which the Scripture cannot be our Plain and diſtinct Rule and Guide*: And he adds on the Margent, *There's not laid down in Scripture, any general Rule, how to anſwer before Magiſtrates, and to act in times of Sufferings.*

To which I anſwer, Firſt he doth not well to confound Rule and Guide; it is granted the Spirit of God is the Guide, Teacher and Leader of the Faithful; but it doth not therefore follow, that the Holy Scriptures, *i. e.* the many excellent Inſtructions, Precepts and Examples given us therein, for the Government of our Life in all Eſtates, are not the Rule which the Holy Spirit uſeth as his Inſtrument, to Guide us,

in

in all parts of our Duty. But he might have told us ſome of thoſe Thouſand Caſes, in which the Scripture cannot be our plain and diſtinct Rule, whereby to know either our Duty to perform it, or what is prohibited, that we may avoid it, though we have the inward aſſiſtance of God's Spirit to enlighten our Minds; and ſet before them, on all neceſſary occaſions and emergencies, ſuch Scripture Precepts and Prohibitions, as ſuit with the preſent occaſions. But if the caſes be of things in themſelves ſimply indifferent, *i. e.* neither commanded nor forbidden, either by any Precepts of God, or Juſt Precepts and Laws of our Superiors, we are left to our choice, according as our rational Faculties, and Chriſtian Prudence, ſhall direct us, a due regard over all being had, to the Glory of God; and that whatever we do, be done in the Spirit of true Love and Charity; which are general Rules plainly given us in the Holy Scriptures; the particular application of which in all particular Caſes, whither in relation to Superiors, Inferiors or Equals, the Holy Spirit by his ſpecial Illuminations in our Hearts will teach us, as we faithfully pray and wait for them, without the need of any other general or particular Rules, than what already are given us in the Holy Scriptures. Therefore in oppoſition to this extravagant and raſh Aſſertion of *W. P*, that there

there are a Thousand Cases, in which the Scripture cannot be our plain and distinct Rule; I affirm, that there is not one Case, respecting our Duty either towards God, our selves or our Neighbours, but plain Instructions, and Precepts are given us in the Holy Scriptures concerning the same; but we still need the Grace and Guidance of God's Holy Spirit, to give us the Spiritual discovery of them, and to enable us rightly to practise them. Surely *David* had a far better and greater esteem of God's Laws, Precepts and Testimonies, even as outwardly delivered by *Moses*, and also by himself, than *W. P.* hath; concerning which he said *Psal.* 119. 24. *Thy Testimonies also are my delight and my Counsellors.* Though *David* was a Prophet, yet, as King over the People of *Israel*, he was commanded of God, to write him a Copy of the Law of God, in a *Book*, which was to be with him, and he was to Read therein all the days of his Life, that he might learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of that Law, and these Statutes to do them, *&c Deut.* 17. 18, 19, 20. And yet *David* was highly illuminated and inspired, far above *W. P.* or any of his Brethren, but the written Law, was to be the Rule of his Actions as well as of other Men. Nor could *David* have excused himself from taking the written

ten Law, to be the Rule of his Life, becauſe he had it in his Heart; and if it could be no excuſe to *David*, nor can it be to any Chriſtian now, [King or Subject,] that becauſe they have the Law writ in their Hearts, and the Spirit put in their inward parts, according to God's promiſe in the New Covenant, that therefore the Laws of God, both of the Old and New Teſtament, that are of a Moral concern, even as outwardly delivered do not bind them, which is in very deed to take away the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, and make void the Prophetical and Kingly Office of Chriſt, yea and the Office of the Holy Spirit alſo, who inſpired the Holy Pen-men to commit them to Writing. And it is no leſs extravagant and raſh in *W. P.* to aſſert, that there is not laid down in Scripture any general Rule how to anſwer before Magiſtrates, and to act in times of Sufferings; for though no particular words are given us, limiting and determining us what to ſay, yet the general matter of our Duty is plainly laid down in Scripture, what and how to anſwer before Magiſtrates, as that of *Peter* and *John*, *Acts* 4. 19. How that it is better to obey God than Men, and that of the three Children to King *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Dan.* 3. 17, 18. And how to act in Times of Suffering, we have both excellent commands

and examples in Scripture, as *Mat.* 10. 28. 1 *Pet.* 2. 20. 1 *Pet.* 4. 16. *Luke* 23. 34. *Acts* 7. 59, 60. But seeing he doth so peremptorily require a general Rule, to suit all Cases, as well as all Persons of Mankind, otherwise it could not be general, which yet he will have it to be, what those dictates or Revelations of the Light in every Conscience are of *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Christians*, that can give such plain directions, to all Persons in all Cases, which the Scripture cannot give, I desire him to tell at least some of them, If he doth not, it is a sign he cannot, and that consequently his Argument is vain, for the Light or Spirit abstractly considered without all Revelation can be no Rule.

---

## Section 13.

### *His fourteenth Argument (which he calls his eighth) answered.*

Page 120. After he has given Thirteen Reasons, and all false ones enough, as I think I have sufficiently shewed, he comes to that he calls his eighth reason after his former Thirteen at least: Why the Scriptures cannot be the Rule under the New Covenant

Covenant which is this, *Chriſt the Spiritual Leader of a Spiritual* Iſrael, *writeth his Spiritual Law in the Heart, as* Moſes, *the outward* Iſrael's *Leader, writ the Law upon Tables of Stone. This was God's Promiſe, and the priviledge and bleſſing of the New Covenant, that as the outward* Jew *had an outward Law for a directory, the inward* Jew *ſhould have an inward Law for his directory; and as the outward* Jew *had an outward* Prieſt, *at whoſe Mouth he ought to ſeek the Law, ſo the* Jew *inward and Circumciſion in Spirit, has an* inward and Spiritual High-Prieſt, *whoſe Lips preſerve knowledge, at whoſe Mouth he is to receive the Law of Life.* The King, Ruler, Judge, Law-giver, High-Prieſt, Law, Rule, *are all Spiritual ſo the Scriptures inform us. My Kingdom, ſaid Chriſt, is not of this World. Again, the Kingdom of God is within,* Luk. 17. 20, 21. *I will write my Law in their Hearts. They ſhall be all taught of me.* Heb. 8. 10. *quoting* Rev. 21. 3. Joel 2. 28. Tit. 2. 11, 12. Job. 32. 8. Rom. 1. 19. [ *And here again he falſly quotes the words,* Whatever may be known of God, *&c.*] Gal. 5. 16. 1 John 1. 7. Iſa. 2. 5. Rev. 21. 23. Gal. 6. 15, 16. *as alſo he quotes unduly* 1 Cor. 12. 7. *putting a meaſure of the Spirit for a manifeſtation of the Spirit.*

*Anſw.* 1. If the Light within be a general Rule to Mankind, then the outward *Iſrael* had it as well as the inward *Iſrael*;

Where is then the diſtinction, and difference betwixt the one and the other? 2. If the Rule of the inward *Iſrael* be within, and the *High-Prieſt* within, then as the inward *Iſrael*, has no Rule, to be the Rule of their Faith and Life, but the Light in the Conſcience, ſo they have no High-Prieſt without them but only within them, that is, the Light in the Conſcience; and ſo there is no High-Prieſt without us, nor no Heaven without us, into which the Man Chriſt Jeſus is gone; nor King Chriſt without us, but only within us; for to ſay he is both without us and within us alſo, will ſpoil *W. P.*'s Argument altogether, and mar his Analogy, *betwixt the Law without under* Moſes, *and the Law within under Chriſt, the High-Prieſt without then, and the High-Prieſt within now.* If he grant there is a High-Prieſt without us, and who is alſo King, as well as Prieſt, (and that he is more without us than within us, as all true Chriſtians believe, who have not the fulneſs within them, but receive of his fulneſs, and Grace for Grace, and therefore that fulneſs is in the Man Chriſt without them) he muſt alſo grant, that the Law and Rule of Faith is as well without us as within us, and ſo his Argument is ſpoiled, but that he will be loth to grant, for then the fundamental Principle of him and his *Brethren*

is

is pluck'd up by the Roots, by confeſſing to the Man Chriſt, a High-Prieſt without us, or King without us, which will neceſſarily infer the Law and Rule of Faith delivered us by Chriſt without us, is not within us only, but without us alſo, as Chriſt the Law-giver is. Thus we ſee for Love of their (ſuppoſed) Rule of Faith only within them, *W. P.* and his Brethren, who approve his Book, abandon and reject utterly any Chriſt, High-Prieſt, or King without them, as alſo he has done in his *Chriſtian Quaker*, where he will have *P.* 97. *The Lamb without* (in the Paſſover) *to ſhew forth the Lamb within*, (to wit, the Light in the Conſcience) *but not the Lamb Chriſt without, as he was outwardly ſlain.* And yet *W. P.* for all this, hath ſaid in his late anſwer to the Biſhop of *Cork*, *That the Quakers differ little in Doctrine from the Church of* England, *ſetting aſide ſome School Terms.* And in his anſwer to the Biſhop of Cork, *P.* 97. he ſaith, *We* [*i. e.* he and his Brethren] *plainly and intirely believe the Truths contained in the Creed, commonly called the Apoſtles Creed.* But poſſibly ſome fallacy is latent here alſo, as if he had ſaid, they believe the Truths Contained in the *Jews* Talmud, or *Turks* Alcoran, for doubtleſs there are ſome Truths contained in them both, but many Falſhoods, and ſo he may

think there are in that Creed, for all his ſeeming fair Confeſſion to it, and I offer to prove they have disbelieved them all. But how this conſiſts with their having only their High Prieſt, King and Prophet within them, as they have the Law and Rule of their Faith only within them, as *W. P.* here doth Argue, I leave to the intelligent to Judge, and whither this palpable contradiction bewrayes not their great diſingenuity, conſidering that they will not grant, that they are in any one point changed, in their Faith or Doctrine, from what they were ever ſince they were a People but as God and Truth is the ſame, ſo his People, to wit, (the Quakers) are the ſame, as they have in ſo many expreſs words lately Printed, in the Book called the *Quakers Cleared*, &c. 3. As concerning the ſeveral places of Scripture quoted by him, that he brings to prove, the inward Teachings of God, Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, and God's writing his Laws in the Hearts of the Faithful, all this is granted by all Sound Chriſtians, but that is not the true State of the Controverſie betwixt the People called *Quakers*, and their Opponents. But the true State of the Controverſie is this, whither the inward Teachings of God, of Chriſt, and of the Holy Spirit, come to believers, without all outward means, and without all outward

Miniſtry

Miniſtry and Service of Men or Books; and whither the Law, and Rule of Faith, that Believers have in them, put in them, yea, and writ in their Hearts by the Lord himſelf, is without all outward Inſtruction, and Teaching, or Service of Men, or Books; or whither the Law, and Rule of Faith and Practiſe within, in reſpect of all the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of the Chriſtian Religion, be not (ſo to ſpeak) a Tranſcript, or Copy from the Law, and Rule of Faith, without us, as delivered in the Holy Scriptures, which therefore may be called the Original as to us, though that Original Law and Rule without us, came from an inward Original in the Holy Prophets, and in the Man Chriſt, and his Holy Evangeliſts and Apoſtles, which yet had a higher Original, to wit, the Archetypal Law, as it was in God, before the Copy or Tranſcript of it came to be in the Prophets, and from them, committed to writing outwardly, and from that outward writing, transferred and tranſcribed into the Hearts of the Faithful, where it becomes an inward Law, or Rule in them: And thus the Faithful have the Law and Rule of Faith both without them and within them; firſt without them, in the Holy Scriptures; next within them, put in them by the Lord in their Hearts, by means of outward Inſtruction, as Preaching, Read-

ing, &c. And if the Queſtion be asked, Whither is beſt, to have it without them, or within them? I anſwer, to have it both ways is very neceſſary; for in God's ordinary way of working, we cannot have it within us, if we had it not firſt without us, no more than we can have Food within us, if we had it not firſt without us; for as our outward and bodily Food, that nouriſheth our Bodies, comes into our Bodies from without us, by the Door (ſo to ſpeak) of our Mouth, ſo the wholſome Doctrine of eternal Salvation by Chriſt our Bleſſed Saviour and Redeemer, (by means of which our Souls and inward Man are nouriſhed, being accompanied with the Divine Influences of the Grace and Spirit of God and of Chriſt) comes into our Souls, by the Door of our outward Hearing and Reading in the Holy Scriptures. Again, though there be ever ſo good Food, and ever ſo Plentiful, without us, yet if we receive it not within us, it neither doth nor can nouriſh us: And as the clean Beaſts under the Law, did chew the Cud of what they did eat, for their Nouriſhment, ſo the Faithful, what they outwardly hear and read of God's Word in the Holy Scriptures, muſt meditate upon inwardly, for their Spiritual Food. Thus the great neceſſity of having the Law and Word of God both without us and within us, the Rule of our

Faith

Faith and Life is evidently apparent, ſo long as we live in theſe mortal Bodies: And therefore God hath appointed, and Chriſt hath given an outward Miniſtry, together with his other Gifts and Graces, to his Church, to continue to the end of the World, and to his laſt coming. But again, if it be asked, Is there not an Internal word, Voice or Teaching of Chriſt, diſtinct from the outward word, Voice and Teaching, that outwardly ſoundeth in our outward Ears. I anſwer, There is, but in God's ordinary way, it works in the Faithful, accompanying the outward word; and by means thereof, the which inward word, Voice and Teaching, (properly and ſtrictly ſpeaking) is not any ſingular, new or differing Form of words, but rather a Divine Power, Light and Life, quickning, enlightning and ſtrengthning the Underſtanding and Heart of Man, Spiritually and Savingly to underſtand the Divine Doctrines and Myſteries of the Chriſtian Faith, outwardly delivered in the Holy Scriptures; and not only ſo, but giving the Souls of the Faithful, at times, a Divine Senſe, Sight and Taſte of God's Divine Power, Love and Life, called in Scripture, *A taſting of the heavenly Gift, and of the good Word of God, and of the powers of the World to come*; which Sight, Senſe and Taſte, and Spiritual Feeling, is indeed beyond all that can be either uttered

uttered with the Mouth, heard with the Ear, or conceived in the Mind, in or by any Form of words, as the outward Sight, Senſe, Taſte and Feeling of outward delightful Objects, is beyond all words, and report of them, as the Scripture ſaith, *Eye hath not ſeen, nor Ear heard, nor hath it entred into the Heart, to conceive the good things that God hath prepared for them that love him. But* (as ſaith the Apoſtle *Paul*) *God hath revealed them to us* (to wit, to the Faithful) *by his Spirit*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 9, 10. *Iſaiah* 64. 4. viz. in an earneſt and firſt Fruits, the Harveſt and full Fruition being reſerved for the future State. And here again, if it be asked, what is the Rule, whereby to know ſurely the true Divine Enjoyment, as above deſcribed, from the falſe and counterfeit, that may be nothing other than Satan's Transformings? I anſwer, It is improper in this Caſe, to ask what is the Rule of Faith or Practiſe, becauſe this high Divine Enjoyment, is (properly ſpeaking) neither an Act of Faith nor Practiſe, though it is a proper Conſequent and Concomitant of ſound Faith, and godly and virtuous Practiſe; for as in the exerciſe of the outward Sight, Hearing and Taſte, no Form of words can be a Rule to a Man, to teach him how to See, Hear or Taſte, but the ſound Diſpoſition of the Organs of thoſe Senſes, and the due Application of the Objects,

jects, is all that is requiſite to enable a Man to know what he certainly Sees, Hears and Taſts; ſo when the Spiritual Senſes of the Soul, are awakened by the quickning Power of God, and the Mind fitly and duly diſpoſed, whatever Divine and Spiritual Objects are preſented to that Soul and Mind, it naturally and neceſſarily apprehends them by its Spiritual Senſes, which are as it were the Spiritual Organs of the Inward and Spiritual Man; the beſt and fitteſt Diſpoſition of the Soul and Mind, making it capable for ſuch Divine Enjoyment, is, *Internal Purity of Heart*, as our Saviour hath taught us, ſaying, *Bleſſed are the pure in Heart, for they ſhall ſee God*; that is, always accompanied with a ſound Faith, grounded upon the ſound and wholſome Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures: And though no Form of words can be a Rule, a *Priori*, whereby to diſcern true Enjoyments from falſe and counterfeit, yet a *Poſteriori*, that is, by the Conſequents and Effects, they may ſoon and quickly be diſcerned, if duly examined by the infallible Rule of Faith and Life laid down in the Scriptures, even as a *Poſteriori*; or conſequentially, a Man may know, whither what (he apprehends) he ſeeth, heareth, or taſteth outwardly, be real or imaginary.

Sect.

## Section 14.

*Diverſe places of Scripture explained, and reſcued from his Corrupt Gloſſes and Interpretations.*

BUT before I finiſh my Anſwer to this his laſt Argument, I think fit to take notice, how he has perverted, miſconſtrued, and miſapplied all and every one of the places of Scripture above recited out of his *Page* 21, to prove that the Light in every Man's Conſcience, is the Rule of Faith and Life to every Man, and that without any neceſſary ſuper-addition without or within Men, be they *Jews*, *Mahometans*, *Infidels*, *Chriſtians*, they have all but one and the ſame Rule of Faith and Life, as they have one and the ſame Creator. For indeed not one of theſe places are to be underſtood, as with reſpect to that part of Mankind, that lived or now live in pure Heatheniſm, or Gentiliſm, but ſuch as were or are profeſſed Members of God's Church as the *Jews* were, when our Saviour was bodily preſent on Earth; and as the Chriſtians were and now are, excepting that one place *Rom.* 1. 19. which as I have above noted, he falſly quotes, rendring it, *Whatſoever may be known of God*; which

which as the Engliſh Tranſlation doth not ſo word, nor doth the Greek bear it, and the Falſeneſs of it I have above deſcribed; as for the ſaying of our Saviour, *My Kingdom is not of this World*; which is the firſt of thoſe Quotations above given: Can it be ſuppoſed, that by his Kingdom there, he meant nothing but the Light in every Man's Conſcience, he offers not the leaſt proof of it; the Kingdom of God, and of Chriſt, in Scripture, (otherwiſe called the Kingdom of Heaven) hath diverſe ſignifications, ſometimes it ſignifies his Church, that is called a Kingdom of Prieſts, ſometimes his Rule and Government in and over his Church, by his Laws, and Precepts, and Power of his Spirit and manifold Gifts and Graces, and ſometimes the Goſpel, with the Bleſſings thereof, that is, the Doctrine of the Goſpel; as where Chriſt ſaid to the *Jews*, *The Kingdom ſhould be taken from them*, Matt. 21. 43. as hath been accordingly fulfilled, though ſtill they have the common Illumination of the Light within them; and ſometimes it ſignifieth his Kingdom of Glory in the future State after Death. This next Quotation is out of *Luke* 17. 20, 21. *The Kingdom of God is within you*; which alſo he falſly quotes, leaving out the word *you*, ſo making it univerſal, to ſerve his Deſign, for a Proof that the Light in every Mans Conſcience, is that

which

which is meant by Chriſt in this place, the Kingdom of God. I grant God has an univerſal providential Kingdom in and over all his Creatures, and more particularly in and over all Mankind, according to *Pſal.* 103. 19. *and his Kingdom ruleth over all*, or in all; and that his providential Kingdom among Men, is adminiſtred in great part, by means of the common Illumination in and over all Men; but the Kingdom, as it is here underſtood *Luke* 17. 20, 21. is not his providential Kingdom, but a new Adminiſtration of the Goſpel, that many were looking for, and expecting, which made the *Phariſees* ask, when the Kingdom of God ſhould come; ſurely as they meant not to ask when his providential Kingdom ſhould come, or when ſhould Men begin to have ſomething to reprove or convince them, for common Sins in their Conſcience; nor did Chriſt mean it ſo, but of ſome more excellent Diſpenſation by his Doctrine and Preaching, which the *Phariſees* had heard as well as others; and therefore it might well be ſaid to be not only among them, as ſome tranſlate it, but even in them, to wit, the Doctrine of the Kingdom, together with which ſome inward Seed of Light might have been ſown in ſome of their Hearts by his Miniſtry, beyond and above the common Illumination. But what proof is this, that the *Gentiles* had

the

the Kingdom of God in them, in this Senſe, who never to this day heard Chriſt, or any of his Miniſters, nor received any Goſpel Doctrine, by any outward Teſtimony, by voice or writing. And *Heb.* 8. 10. compared with *Jer.* 31. 33. and all the other places do wholly reſpect that part of Mankind, to whom the Goſpel is outwardly preached, and for moſt part ſuch who did believe it, or were in due time to believe it, as that noted place *Titus* 2. 11, 12. by the Grace of God, that had appeared to all, cannot be underſtood, the common Light or Illumination in all, becauſe *v.* 13. it was ſuch a Grace, that taught ſuch who gave up to be taught by it, and obey it, to look for that bleſſed Hope and glorious Appearance of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who gave himſelf for us [to dye for us, that by his Death, and precious Blood outwardly ſhed for us] he might redeem us from all Iniquity. Now can *W. P.* or any of his Deiſt Brethren, prove that any *Jew*, *Mahometan*, *Heathen*, or *Deiſt*, that obey the Dictates of the Light within, are taught thereby to look for this glorious appearing of Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſhall come in his glorified Manhood, to judge the Quick and the Dead, for that no doubt is the glorious Appearing here meant, the moſt Obedient of his Jewiſh Mahometan Brethren to the Light within them

them, and the moſt ſtrict and exact Deiſts here in *England* will tell him, they believe no ſuch thing, their Light within them hath taught them no ſuch Faith nor Hope; yea, *Cornelius* that was a moſt excellent *Gentile* for Virtue, and I ſuppoſe in his Gentile ſtate ſurpaſſed for Piety and Virtue, the beſt Deiſt in *England*, was not taught by the Light that was formerly in him in his Gentile ſtate, to believe Remiſſion of Sin through Faith in Jeſus of *Nazareth*, whom the *Jews* hanged on a Tree, *&c.* but was informed by the Angel, to ſend for *Peter* to preach this Jeſus to him; nor did the Angel direct him to the Light in him ſimply for Information, but to the Apoſtle *Peter* without him, that by means of his Miniſtry he might receive the Chriſtian Faith, and the ſpecial Illumination of the Holy Ghoſt, as accordingly was fulfilled. And as to the words *Jer.* 31. 34. compared with *Heb.* 8. 11. *they ſhall not teach every Man his neighbour, and every Man his Brother, ſaying, Know the Lord: For all ſhall know me, from the leaſt to the greateſt.* This Promiſe doth only belong to the Children of the New Covenant, to wit, the Members of Chriſt's Catholick Church, and not to all Mankind, therefore cannot be meant of the common Illumination in Heathens and Infidels, nor of many Thouſands living under a viſible Profeſſion of Chriſtianity,

anity, who are not ſo taught of God, that they need not a Man to teach them; or to ſay, know the Lord, for to be ſo taught is a high State, and the words have their full and perfect accompliſhment in the future State, though in part here; and comparatively, they have their preſent fulfilling, as often indeed many places of Scripture have a comparative meaning Beſides, that it is granted, that that high degree of Divine knowledge above deſcribed, that is, a divine enjoyment of God, by Spiritual Senſation, Sight and Taſte, one Man cannot teach it to another, for it ſurpaſſeth all words, either uttered or conceived; as one Man cannot teach another that is Blind to ſee, or Deaf to hear, or that hath not his Taſte, to Savour; though as to the Doctrinal knowledge, he may teach him, and by means of that Teaching, be made inſtrumental, by the bleſſing and Grace of God, to open his Spiritual Eyes, and excite thoſe Spiritual Senſations in him. And what though Chriſt left nothing in Writing by himſelf, for the Rule of Faith and practiſe, as *W. P.* argueth, what his Apoſtles and Evangeliſts committed to Writing by his Inſpiration, was ſufficient, why it ſhould be received to be the Rule of our Faith, that is, the outward Inſtrument, whereby Faith is wrought in us, and whereby we may be

helped, through the Spirits inward Illumination and aſſiſtance, how to diſcern what we are to believe to be true Doctrine, and what we are to practiſe. But it's very ſtrange what he further ſaith, *That had he intended the Rule of his followers to have been a written Rule,* [note, *a written Rule*] *he would have left it upon record, with all punctuality, this muſt be believed and that done, on pain of Eternal Death.* His words plainly import, as if ſuch punctuality had not been recorded, but as if People who read the Scriptures, or hear them ever ſo truly expounded, were left at liberty to believe this or the other thing, or not belive it, though written and commanded; and alſo to do or not do, without any danger of Damnation; whereas the plain words of our Saviour are recorded by *Mark* 16.16. *He that believeth not ſhall be Damned*; believeth not what? ſurely both what Chriſt Preached, and what his Apoſtles and Evangeliſts were inſpired to write, by his Spirit, to whom thoſe Writings ſhould come, for others to whom they have not come, their Sins againſt the Law and Light in their Conſciences, are ſufficient to render them without excuſe. *But* (ſaith he) *nor did his followers write in the method of a Rule.* How knows he that? Is he ſo great a Maſter of Method, ſo as that he can prove, they write not in the Method

Method of a Rule? What ſaith he to Chriſt's Sermon on the Mount, and his other Sermons recorded by the Four Evangeliſt's, which alone, though we had no other parts of the New Teſtament, are a ſufficient Rule both of Faith and Life, which yet makes not the other parts ſuperfluous: It is a good ſaying, Abundance of the Law breaks not the Law; as God's ways are not as Man's ways, ſo God's Method, in delivering us the Rule of Faith and Life, is not as Man's Method. And what ſaith he to *Luke*, who (*Luke* 1. 13.) declareth, that *having had perfect underſtanding of all things from the very firſt*, it ſeemed good to him to write them in *Order*; and ſaid *John*, (John 20. 31.) *Theſe are written, that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have Life through his Name.* It is ſtrange that a *Quaker* ſhould argue againſt the Scripture being the Rule of Faith and Life for wanting the Method of a Rule, who may be thought very improper Judges of Method, being ſo immethodical themſelves both in Writing and Preaching, and cry out againſt others for Method; and yet now the Scriptures muſt be rejected from being the Rule of Faith and Life, for not being writ in the Method of a Rule, If *W. P.* muſt be believed, whereas the beſt skilful in the Method of Teaching, both pious and learned, have not

only greatly esteemed, but highly admir'd the Method of the Scripture, even when it seems least to have Method, and most especially, the Method of our Saviour's Sermons recorded in the Four Evangelists, and of that most excellent form of Prayer he taught his Disciples. And if the Scriptures must be rejected from being not only the Rule of Faith and Life, but *a written Rule* (as his expres words above noted are, though in contradiction to himself, who elsewhere calls them a Rule, but not the Rule; now he will neither have them to be the Rule, nor a written Rule) for want of the Method of a Rule, he may quarrel against diverse parts of God's Creation, as not being placed in that Method and Order, that his Wisdom thinks meet. Sure I am, some Atheists have argued at such like rate, against the Worlds being Created by an infinite Wisdom and Goodness, because, as they imagined things lye in great disorder, throughout the visible World, here a spot of the Earth fruitful, there a great part of it unfruitful, and uninhabitable; some parts have too much Water that drown the dry Land, overflow Cities, fruitful Fields and pleasant Meadows; other parts are scorched with drought and uninhabitable for want of Water; other large parts not fit for Habitation for Cold. Also the Providences of God towards Mankind

are

are greatly diſputed by Atheiſts, becauſe of that ſeeming diſorder and want of method, in things and Events that happen to Men of all ſorts, virtuous Men neglected, oppreſſed, afflicted, and vitious Men exalted, honoured and praiſed. It is a great Default in *W. P.* thus to argue againſt the Scriptures, for want of Method, as being the Rule, wherein he too much reſembles the Atheiſts arguing againſt the Ways and Methods of Divine Providence, from thence concluding there is no Rule of Divine Providence in the World, as *W. P.* concludes, there is not the Rule of Faith and Life in the Holy Scriptures.

---

## Section 15.

*Whither the Laws and Precepts of God and Chriſt, as written in the Holy Scriptures, do bind the Faithful to Obedience.* W. P. *his abſolute Neceſſaries of Religion, no other but what are generally owned by* Infidel Jews, Mahomitans, Deiſts, *and the greateſt Hereticks.*

HAving thus finiſhed my Anſwers to his Arguments againſt the Scriptures being the Rule of Faith and Life, yea, not

only againſt being the Rule, but a Rule, as above noted, in contradiction to himſelf, who ſometimes calls them *a Rule*, to wit, *a Subordinate, Secondary and Declaratory Rule*; but yet he will not allow this to the whole Scripture, but that ſeveral parts of it are ſo, that is, ſo much of it as Heathens and Deiſts have taught them by the Light within, to wit, Precepts of Moral Honeſty, *&c.* but Salvation by Chriſt Crucified, and Remiſſion of Sins by his Blood, is not taught them by their Light within; therefore this Doctrine of the Scripture is not ſo much as a Secondary Rule to *W. P.* and his Deiſt Brethren; the unſoundneſs of which Diſtinction I have above ſhewed, I ſhall now briefly point at ſome other Impertinencies in his Book now before me, and ſo conclude.

Page 25. *We confeſs* (ſaith he) *the reaſon of our Obedience*, viz. *to the Precepts written in the Scriptures, is not meerly becauſe they are written, for that were legal, but becauſe they are the Eternal Precepts of the Spirit in Mens Conſciences.* Here divers things need Correction; Firſt, I know none that ever ſaid, that the reaſon of our Obedience to thoſe Precepts, is *meerly* becauſe they are written, but chiefly and principally we are obliged to believe and obey them, being the Commands of God: but though the reaſon of our Obedience to them, is not meerly that they are written,

written, yet being now written, and the Wiſdom of God having ſo appointed it, that they ſhould be written, and the Writers being inſpired to that very purpoſe, to write them for our Inſtruction, and that we ſhould believe them and obey them; we ought both to believe them and obey them, as they are outwardly written; otherwiſe, if their deliverance to us by writing, have no Influence on us to believe them, and obey them, we may wholly diſregard them as ſuch, and only mind thoſe eternal Precepts of the Spirit, as he terms them, in the Conſciences of Men, to wit, *Jews*, *Mahometans*, *Heathens*, *Deiſts*. Again that he ſaith, *It is legal to obey them, meerly becauſe written* I ſee not how it was legal, for the Law did not command them to obey them meerly as written, but becauſe they were the Commandments of God; but to reject them, as having any Influence on us, or laying any Obligation on us as written, is to reject Chriſt's Prophetical and Kingly Office, a part of which was to inſpire his Evangeliſts and Apoſtles to commit them to writing. But again, That *nothing is to be obeyed for a Rule, or the Rule, but the eternal Precepts of the Spirit in Mens Conſciences*, as he affirmeth. This indeed makes a very ſhort and near way to Heaven, were it as true as ſhort and near. He ſeems to give us an account what theſe eternal

Precepts are, *Page* 44. *But moſt Perſwaſions* (ſaith he) *are agreed about the abſolute Neceſſaries in Religion, from that Light and Witneſs God has placed in Man's Conſcience*, viz. *That God is, that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him; that the way of God is a way of Purity, Patience, Meekneſs*, &c. *without which no Man can ſee the Lord.*

*Anſw.* Note well, Reader, theſe few things, That every *Deiſt*, *Jew* and *Mahometan*, that are ſober and rational, will acknowledge, are all the abſolute Neceſſaries in Religion, that he lays down. But how falſly doth he alledge that moſt Perſwaſions are agreed, that theſe, without all the Articles peculiar to the Chriſtian Faith, (as concerning the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation of the Word, the Satisfaction of Chriſt, by his Sacrifice on the Croſs to Divine Juſtice, &c. in a word, all the twelve Articles of the Apoſtles Creed) are all the abſolute Neceſſaries in Religion. Is the whole Chriſtian Catholick Church of Chriſt throughout the World, in all Ages, no conſiderable part of Mankind, having Religious Perſwaſions? Or if they are, let him tell us, what part of Chriſt's Catholick Church ever held, or doth now hold, that none of all the twelve Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, or few of them, are the abſolute Neceſſaries in Religion, together with other Moral parts relating to Moral Virtues.

I think he can tell us ſcarce any, but ſuch as may be juſtly doubted, or diſowned to be Members of the Church of Chriſt. If he bring in himſelf, and his Party and Deiſt Brethren, he but begs the Queſtion, to ſay, they are a part of the Chriſtian Church, while they deny the great Fundamentals of her Religion to be abſolutely neceſſary. But let us hear him further in the ſame Page, he ſaith, *Nay they accord in ſome conſiderable Matters ſuperadded, as ſome of them ſpeak, that God was manifeſted extraordinarily in the Fleſh; that he gave his Life for the World; that ſuch as believe and obey his Grace in their Hearts, receive Remiſſion of Sins, and Life everlaſting.* Firſt, It is needful he ſhould explain what he means by theſe words, *That he gave his Life*; whither the Life of the Man Chriſt without us, or the Blood, which is the Life, and that Life is the Light within, as he hath been heard to preach, and is according to his Books. And what means he by the word *believe?* Whither to believe, that Chriſt died for our Sins, and roſe again? Well, in Charity I will ſuppoſe this to be his meaning, otherwiſe he would greatly equivocate; but ſtill all this belief is none of the abſolute Neceſſaries in Religion, they are ſome conſiderable Matters ſuperadded; Superadded to what? To the Scriptures. Nay, they are the chief Doctrines of the Scriptures.

Scriptures. Therefore again I ask, Superadded to what? Why to the Light within its Dictates. But are they neceſſary to be believed, ſince they are ſupernumerary, and ſuperadded to the Dictates of the Light in every Conſcience? *Yea*, ſaith *W. P.* Page 35. *where the Hiſtory has reached, and the Spirit of God has made a Conviction upon the Conſcience.* Well then, If they are neceſſary to be believed, where the Spirit of God hath made this Conviction upon the Conſcience; this Conviction is not the Effect of the general Light in every Conſcience, but ſomewhat ſuperadded; and therefore the general Light in the Conſcience, is not the perfect and compleat Rule. But what if the Spirit make not this Conviction upon the Conſcience of ſome, who have the Scripture, which he calls the Hiſtory? Is he ſure the Spirit will make it, or doth make it, on every Conſcience to whom the Hiſtory reacheth? If he ſay yea, he throweth down his Fabrick with his own words; for if ſo, this Conviction made by the Spirit of God on the Conſcience, muſt be a part, yea, the greateſt part of the Rule of Faith, to all who have the Scriptures; becauſe the Scriptures hold forth many more things to be believed and practiſed, than theſe few eternal Precepts, as he calls them, of the Spirit in the Conſcience. And though *W. P.* here ſeems to render

render them excuſable, to whom the Doctrine of Chriſt's Death hath reached, and yet believe it not, on whom the Spirit of God hath not made a Conviction. Yet in his Treatiſe of *Spiritual Liberty*, he calls it a looſe Plea, to pretend want of Conviction for not obeying *G. F*'s Orders, and tending to Ranteriſm. But if he ſhall ſay, the Spirit doth not work this Conviction upon many that the Hiſtory reacheth, as his words import, then they are left at liberty, whither to believe them at all, without all Sin or danger. Thus we may ſee what ſort of Faith he and his Brethren have, of the Articles of the Creed, *viz.* An unneceſſary Faith, to have it, or not have it, is all a Caſe, if they have it not, it is not their Sin, their primary Rule the Light within them, tells them nothing of it. But then why ſhould the Secondary Rule tell them any of theſe things? As there is nothing in the Copy but what is in the Original, ſo there is nothing in the Secondary Rule, the Scriptures, at this rate, but what is in the Dictates of the Light within; and therefore all that is to be found in the Scripture, that is not in the Dictates of the Light within, is not ſo much as the Secondary Rule. Thus we may ſee of what little value the Scriptures are and muſt be with him and his Party, by this his way of arguing and anſwering Obje-

Objections. But note, Reader, how in his foregoing words I have faithfully quoted, he makes the believing and obeying God's Grace for Remiſſion of Sins, and Life everlaſting, to be none of the abſolute Neceſſaries of Religion, but ſuperadded, as ſome of them ſpeak. Here is Obedience to God's Grace made as unneceſſary by *W. P.* as Faith in Chriſt, as he was outwardly manifeſt in the Fleſh. What thinks *G. W.* and his Brethren of this Doctrine? Is it not plain *Antinomianiſm*, yea plain *Ranteriſm*?

---

## Section 16.

*The Scriptures are not certainly known and believed, upon the Foundation of* W. P. *and his Party among the Quakers, but are upon the Foundation of all Orthodox Chriſtians. The Queſtion wrongly ſtated by* W. P. *about the Sufficiency of the Light or Spirit of God within, which is not what he can reveal, but what he doth reveal, without the outward Means of Inſtruction.*

Page 23. HE labours to turn off that Objection againſt him, of his arguing from the uncertainty of the Scriptures, that

that they cannot be a Rule of Faith and Life, by anſwering, *The Scriptures are uncertain upon their Foundation*, but not upon ours. *We would have them received* (ſaith he) *upon the Spirits Teſtimony and Evidence which gave them forth.* I anſwer, And ſo would all true Chriſtians; but the difference is great, in the way and manner of their and his defining this Teſtimony or Evidence, which he and his Brethren will have wholly to be by Prophetical and Apoſtolical Inſpiration, the ſame in Specie and Kind with what the Prophets and Apoſtles had, giving them a new repetition of the ſame Articles and Precepts, and all this only from the Light within, as it is a common diſpenſation to all Mankind; the falſity of which, common experience, as well as the Teſtimony of Scripture doth ſufficiently prove; for if the Light within them doth *de novo*, give *W. P.* and his Brethren, the Revelation of all or moſt of theſe peculiar Doctrines of Chriſtianity, why ſhould they have it more than *Jews*, *Mahometans*, *Deiſts* and *Heathens*, many of whom they account have been, and are faithful and obedient to the Dictates of the Light within them. *Beſides* if more be revealed to the *Quakers* by the common Light within, than to other parts of Mankind, who have not the Scriptures; they muſt needs grant, their Rule of Faith is more

more large and full, than that in others; and conſequently not being ſo perfect in others, as in them, it is no general Rule of Faith, for thus he argued againſt the Scriptures. *But* if the Scriptures, are ſo wholly uncertain upon the foundation of other Chriſtians, and ſo certain upon the foundation of the *Quakers*, from their pretence to the ſame divine Inſpiration that the Prophets and Apoſtles had, they would wonderfully oblige the Chriſtian World, If we could believe them, to tell us, *from their infallibility*, what Tranſlations are beſt; or rather to give us a new Tranſlation by divine Inſpiration; and which of all the Copies, and various lections are trueſt: but that this is a groundleſs and empty brag, is too apparent, while their ignorance, and groſs perverſions of Scripture, and falſe Interpretations, are greater than any other in Chriſtendom, as can eaſily be proved. But in contradiction to all this, that the Scriptures are certain, upon the *Quakers* foundation, from the divine Inſpiration, and Revelation that the Spirit has given them of their Truth, much or indeed moſt of all this is again denyed by *W. P.* telling us, in anſwer to that Objection *Page* 32. *This Light you ſpeak of, could not tell you, which way Sin came into the World, that there was an* Adam *and* Eve, *that they fell after that manner,*

*and*

*and that Sin ſo entred the World, that Chriſt was born of a Virgin, ſuffered Death, and roſe again*, &c. He roundly anſwereth, that inaſmuch as an account of thoſe things hath been already revealed, and is extant, therefore any new Revelation of ſuch things is not needed. I anſwer, How not needed? and yet certain to you, upon the Spirits inward Evidence and Teſtimony, and to none but you, and ſuch as you, who pretend to the ſame Revelations with the Prophets and Apoſtles? However, ſeeing he grants, he and his Brethren have no Revelation from the Light within them, *That Chriſt was born of a Virgin, ſuffered Death, and roſe again*; therefore he muſt needs confeſs, all theſe things concerning Chriſts Birth, Death, Reſurrection, are uncertain to them, and ſo no matters of their Faith. And then ſeeing other Chriſtians believe theſe things upon an inward Evidence and Teſtimony of the Spirit, though not by the ſame Revelation in Kind or Specie with that of the Prophets and Apoſtles; yet by way of Seal to the truth of them, as above explained, the proper conſequence of which is this, that all theſe great things recorded in Scripture, concerning Chriſt's birth of a Virgin, his having dyed for our Sins, his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion and Interceſſion for us in Heaven, are altogether uncertain upon the *Quakers* foun-

foundation, becauſe as *W. P.* confeſſeth not inwardly revealed to them, which yet are certain upon the foundation of all true Chriſtians, to wit, the inward Teſtimony and Evidence of the Spirit, by way of ſealing to the Truth of them, as by an objective medium, as above explained. *But* why are not theſe things, concerning Chriſt's *Birth*, Death, revealed to the *Quakers* by *W. P*'s confeſſion? Why; becauſe they are not neceſſary to be believed, they are none of the Eternal Precepts of the Spirit in the Conſciences of all Men, Teaching ſome few things of owning a great God Almighty, and ſome few moral Principles, of Temperance and Juſtice, as doing as we would be done by; this is the *Quakers Evangelium Eternum*, their everlaſting Goſpel, whatever is more is unneceſſary and Superfluous.

*Page* 32. He ſaith, *To ſay the Light or Spirit could not do it*, [*viz.* reveal that *Chriſt was born of a Virgin, ſuffered Death, and roſe again*, &c.] *is blaſphemous as well as abſurd*: *Anſw.* I know none that ſaith, the Spirit or God and Chriſt conſidered as the Light, could not do it; but that's not the Queſtion, what the Spirit could do, or what the Light within, taking it in the higheſt Senſe, as to ſignifie the divine Word, could or can do; but the proper ſtate of the queſtion is, whither the Spirit, or Light within, hath

hath given, generally any such Revelation of these things; which if he hath not given, and that to all Men, then to be sure, even by *W. P.*'s confession, such Revelation is no part of the Rule of Faith, for it is not what God who is Light, or the Spirit can reveal, but what he hath revealed that is the Rule of Faith, and doth ordinarily reveal. And seeing the *Quakers*, as *W. P.* hath granted, have no inward Revelation of these things, *viz. That Christ was born of a Virgin*, &c. It is no part of their Faith, or Creed, for the Rule of their Faith hath not taught it them. If any have said, the Light within every man cannot reveal these things, they do not mean by the Light within, either Christ or the Spirit, but that common Illumination that is in all Men, that is neither Christ nor the Spirit, but yet is a gift of Christ and of the Spirit.

## Section 17.

*His Proofs out of the Fathers, and Primitive Proteſtants, for the Spirits being the Rule of Faith, all Fallacious. An Inſtance of* Calvin (*quoted by him*) *in ſome Paſſage of his Inſtitutions, expreſly to the contrary. Whither the* Eſſeni, Pythagoras, Clinias, *and the* Scythians, *before our Saviour's Incarnation, thought Swearing unlawful, from the Light within.*

AS for theſe, many Authors ſome Fathers, and other late Proteſtant Authors, that he quotes in confirmation of his Aſſertion, *viz.* That the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith and Life, but the Light in every Conſcience; none of all theſe quotations, which I have diligently read and conſidered, ſay any ſuch thing, *viz.* That the Scriptures are not the Rule of Faith and Life, or that the Light in every Conſcience is that Rule. Either he is very ignorant, and unacquainted in *Calvin* and *Beza's* writings, and other Proteſtants, or very unfair to quote them, when he cannot but know in his Conſcience, if he be acquainted with them, that all thoſe Proteſtant Authors did Zealouſly

Zealouſly contend, that the Scripture was the Rule of Faith and Life, and though they did Zealouſly aſſert the neceſſity of the Spirits Internal Evidence and Teſtimony, to Seal to the Truth of the Scripture, and give the underſtanding of it, yet none of them all that he has quoted ſay, or hold that the Spirit, or Light in every Conſcience is the Rule of Faith and Life; I remember no ſuch Doctrine taught by them, and yet I ſuppoſe, I know their Doctrine, as well as he; and were it needful, I could produce ſufficient Teſtimonies from their Books, that he has manifeſtly wronged them; but he who takes ſo great liberty to wreſt the Scriptures, no wonder if he make bold to do the ſame with theſe Mens Writings.

His Quotation out of *Calvin* is this, *Inſt. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 8. It is neceſſary the ſame Spirit that ſpake by the mouth of the Prophets, ſhould pierce into our Hearts, to perſwade us that they faithfully delivered that which was committed to them of God. This doth not prove that *Calvin* denyed the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith, having expreſly taught that they were.

But to ſhew how little acquainted *W. P.* is with *Calvin*'s Doctrine in this point, [whom he hath quoted for him, to prove that the Scripture, or written word, is not the Rule of Faith, but the Light in every Con-

ſcience, or the Spirit abſtractly conſidered from the written word] or how unfair and fallacious in ſo doing, if acquainted with his writings, I ſhall give ſome paſſages out of his Inſtitutions.

*Nam cum humana mens pro ſua imbecillitate, pervenire ad Deum nullo modo queat, niſi ſacro ejus verbo adjuta & ſublevata, omnes tunc mortales, exceptis Judæis, quia Deum ſine verbo quærebant neceſſe fuit in vanitate atque errore verſari.* Calvin Inſtit. Lib. 1. c. 6. S. 4.

That is, in Engliſh. For when the mind of Man, for its weakneſs, could by no way come to God, unleſs helped and aſſiſted by his Holy Word, it was neceſſary that all Men, the *Jews* excepted, did walk in vanity and error, becauſe they ſought God without the Word.

Thus we ſee, according to *Calvin*, how neceſſary was the Word of God, to wit, the Doctrine outwardly delivered of God to Men, by the Holy Prophets, to bring them to God, out of error and vanity, for by the *Holy Word*, it is manifeſt, *Calvin* meant not the Light within, which all Mankind had, as well as the *Jews*, but the *outward Word of Doctrine* delivered by the Prophets, according to *Pſal.* 147. 19. *He ſhewed his Word unto Jacob*, &c. The which external Word, he calls, Sect. 1. *Aliud & melius adminiculum, i. e. another and better help*, which was neceſſary, to direct us rightly to the

the Creator of the World, comparing it with whatever other helps God had given to Mankind, (without them or within them,) which he calls, *Communia illa Documenta*, thoſe common *Documents*, the which external Word, (he ſaith) is *Rectior & certior ad ipſum Cognoſcendum nota, i. e.* a more right and more ſure Mark, whereby to know him, which alſo he calls, *the Rule of the Eternal verity*, and *cap. 9. Sect. 1. l. 1. inſt.* He calleth them *Nebulones i. e.* Knaves, and chargeth them with *Nefarious Sacriledge*, that divide the Word, to wit, the external Word from the Spirit, which God hath Joyned together by an inviolable Bond; and in the Title of that Chapter, he calleth them *Fanaticks*, and ſaith, *They overthrow all the Principles of Piety, who deſpiſing the Scripture, (to wit, conſidered as the Rule) flee over to Revelation, pretending to be taught by the Spirit, without the external Word.* Where it is evident, he doth not mean, that whoever are taught by the outward Word, are ſufficiently taught, without the Spirit; but that whoever are taught Savingly, to know God as the Creator, or Chriſt the Redeemer, they are taught of the Spirit, with and by the external Word, as the inſtrument of the Spirit which he hath given to us, for a Rule of Faith and Life, not that it's the Rule to the Spirit, but the Rule to us of the

Spirits giving and preparing, and which he perſwades us to be Truth, by his ſecret operation in us. And as unfair and fallacious as *W. P.* hath been, in wreſting, miſapplying and abuſing *Calvin*'s words, to prove that he was not of another Mind, than *W. P. viz.* That the Scriptures is not the Rule of Faith and Life, he is as unfair, abſurd and fallacious in his quoting other late Proteſtant Authors, as Biſh. *Jewel*, *Dr. Ames*, *Dr. Owen*, all which are ſufficiently known by their Books to be of a contrary Mind, as much, as one thing can be to another: The Quotations indeed taken out of thoſe Authors, prove, that they did aſſert the neceſſity of the Spirits inward Operation, in the Souls of Men, to perſwade them, to believe the Truth of the Scriptures, and the neceſſity of his Internal Illumination, to give the Saving underſtanding of them, as particularly the quotation given out of *J. Calvin inſtit. lib.* 1. *c.* 8. who gives the Senſe of all thoſe Authors, and indeed of all true Chriſtians, *viz.* It is neceſſary, the ſame Spirit, that ſpake by the Mouth of the Prophets, ſhould pierce into our Hearts, to perſwade us, that they faithfully delivered that which was committed to them of God, which he illuſtrates by the word *Obſignare*, elſewhere in that Book, that is, by Sealing to the truth of them; but this does

does not prove that this inward Obſignation of the Spirit is the Rule of Faith, even in *Calvin*'s ſenſe; or that the Scripture was not that Rule.

*Page* 36 It's ſtrange that *W. P.* ſhould bring a proof againſt the Lawfulneſs of Swearing, from the Conviction of the Light within ſome *Jews*, long before Chriſt came, to wit, the *Eſſeni*, that when the Scriptures of the Old Teſtament made it lawful to Swear, in ſome Caſes, (if *W. P.* believes that the Spirit of God did Dictate theſe Scriptures) that the ſame Spirit in the *Eſſeni* ſhould teach them that it was unlawful, even while the Moſaical diſpenſation was yet ſtanding. But how proves he that the *Eſſeni* did think Swearing unlawful, from a Conviction of the Light within them, when others of the moſt faithful of the *Jews*, both then and before that time did Judge Swearing Lawful, and that from the declared and revealed Will of God, in the Old Teſtament, that came from the Light within, in *Moſes* and the Prophets, that was in force until Chriſt ſuffered, as to all the other parts of it. If he will allow, that the eternal Precepts of the Spirit in the Conſcience, command one thing to ſome, and the quite contradictory to another, ſurely at this rate, the Light within muſt be a very uncertain Rule, for by this Conceſſion, one may take

the liberty to say, his Light within commands him to Kill, to Steal, to commit Adultery, though the same Light in another forbids it. I had thought, that by the Eter- precepts in the Conscience, *W. P.* had meant, those unchangeable Precepts, and Laws of Justice and Temperance, *&c.* which in all Ages have been the same to all Men, and will ever be the same to all, so long as the World lasteth. But now it seems, even the Precepts of Light within are not Eternal, but Temporal, and may be changed, and one may be commanded to Swear, or permitted without Sin to Swear, and another forbidden. But there are two things that *W. P.* in his instance of the *Essevi* (that would not Swear, which he quotes out of *Josephus* and *Philo*. That they shun Oaths worse than Perjury; for they esteem him Condemned for a Lyer, who without it is not believed,) should prove, neither of which he hath done: First, That they held it Unlawful in any Case to Swear, even when called before Authority, for it may rather be thought, it was common Swearing they were against, [a thing that was too ordinary among the *Jews*,] seeing the Law did allow Swearing in a Judicial way, *Levit.* 5. that was then in force. Secondly, Suppose they were against all Swearing, that they had this from the Light within them,

it

it is much more probable, it was an erronious Opinion in them, which could not proceed from the Light within, otherwiſe it had contradicted the ſtanding Law of God without, then in force, which not only allowed Swearing, but commanded it upon neceſſary Occaſions. And as idle and impertinent are his Inſtances of *Pythagoras*, the *Scythians* in King *Alexander*'s time, and *Clinias*, all which lived ſome hundreds of Years before Chriſt came in the Fleſh. Now if Swearing was lawful by the Law of God among the *Jews* in thoſe Ages, How can we ſuppoſe it unlawful among the *Gentiles*, ſince I know not one Inſtance can be given, that the Light in any *Gentile* did condemn what the Light within, or Law of God without, in the *Jews*, did juſtifie, for this were to ſet Light againſt Light? It's nothing to the purpoſe, if ſome in theſe ancient Times were againſt Swearing, but the Queſtion is, Whither it was the Light in them that taught them ſo; or rather, whither it was not an erronious Opinion, like that of not eating Fleſh, ſaid to be taught alſo by *Pythagoras*, was that (thinks *W. P.*) from the Light within? If ſo, How does the Light in him allow him to eat it, and to take his liberty in diverſe things, that the Severity of *Pythagoras*'s Doctrine did not allow? What if any now ſhould ſay, that the Light within them forbids them to eat Fleſh, How could *W. P.* convince them of

the liberty to ſay, his Light within commands him to Kill, to Steal, to commit Adultery, though the ſame Light in another forbids it. I had thought, that by the Eter-precepts in the Conſcience, *W. P.* had meant, thoſe unchangeable Precepts, and Laws of Juſtice and Temperance, *&c.* which in all Ages have been the ſame to all Men, and will ever be the ſame to all, ſo long as the World laſteth. But now it ſeems, even the Precepts of Light within are not Eternal, but Temporal, and may be changed, and one may be commanded to Swear, or permitted without Sin to Swear, and another forbidden. But there are two things that *W. P.* in his inſtance of the *Eſſeni* (that would not Swear, which he quotes out of *Joſephus* and *Philo.* That they ſhun Oaths worſe than Perjury; for they eſteem him Condemned for a Lyer, who without it is not believed,) ſhould prove, neither of which he hath done: Firſt, That they held it Unlawful in any Caſe to Swear, even when called before Authority, for it may rather be thought, it was common Swearing they were againſt, [a thing that was too ordinary among the *Jews*,] ſeeing the Law did allow Swearing in a Judicial way, *Levit.* 5. that was then in force. Secondly, Suppoſe they were againſt all Swearing, that they had this from the Light within them,

it

it is much more probable, it was an erronious Opinion in them, which could not proceed from the Light within, otherwiſe it had contradicted the ſtanding Law of God without, then in force, which not only allowed Swearing, but commanded it upon neceſſary Occaſions. And as idle and impertinent are his Inſtances of *Pythagoras*, the *Scythians* in King *Alexander*'s time, and *Clinias*, all which lived ſome hundreds of Years before Chriſt came in the Fleſh. Now if Swearing was lawful by the Law of God among the *Jews* in thoſe Ages, How can we ſuppoſe it unlawful among the *Gentiles*, ſince I know not one Inſtance can be given, that the Light in any *Gentile* did condemn what the Light within, or Law of God without, in the *Jews*, did juſtifie, for this were to ſet Light againſt Light? It's nothing to the purpoſe, if ſome in theſe ancient Times were againſt Swearing, but the Queſtion is, Whither it was the Light in them that taught them ſo; or rather, whither it was not an erronious Opinion, like that of not eating Fleſh, ſaid to be taught alſo by *Pythagoras*, was that (thinks *W. P.*) from the Light within? If ſo, How does the Light in him allow him to eat it, and to take his liberty in diverſe things, that the Severity of *Pythagoras*'s Doctrine did not allow? What if any now ſhould ſay, that the Light within them forbids them to eat Fleſh, How could *W. P.* convince them

of

of their Error? If he bring *Paul*'s words, or any other Scripture words to his Conviction, may he not anſwer, that the Scripture is not the Rule of his Faith, and *W. P.* hath confirmed him, by his late Book that ſaith the ſame; and if the Light within, in the *Eſſeni*, might contradict the Scripture of the Old Teſtament, why may not the Light within in a *Quaker*, contradict the Scripture of the New Teſtament, both being given from the ſame Spirit; and the Scripture of the Old Teſtament, as binding to the Jews, before Chriſt's Incarnation, as the Scripture of the New Teſtament is to the Chriſtians ſince. And how can *W. P.* prove, that Poligamy is againſt the Light within? It is granted, that the New Teſtament forbids it. But what then; by *W. P*'s Doctrine, the greateſt things in the New Teſtament, are not neceſſary abſolutely to be believed, but upon Conviction of the Spirit, *i. e.* upon a new Revelation, as that Chriſt was born of a Virgin, dyed for our Sins, *&c.* And he plainly tells us, *Any ſuch new Revelation is not neceſſary:* If this be not to turn People looſe, and to run them into great Confuſion, Light againſt Light, and Spirit againſt Spirit, while the Holy Scripture is denied to be the Rule of Faith and Life; yea, a Rule, I leave to the Sober and Intelligent to judge.

Sect.

## Section 18.

*A Correction of a Saying of* W. P. *Scandalous and Offenſive to Chriſtian Ears,* That Men are not like to be informed of the Knowledge and Experience of the New Birth, from our Saviour's words to *Nicodemus*, John 3. Nor can that Scripture be my Rule *(ſaith he)* in that heavenly travel, *&c.* Neither can any other Writing whatever.

Page 29. HERE I find one paſſage more in this book of *W. P*'s, that I am ſure greatly derogates from the Scriptures, and is juſtly offenſive to Chriſtian Ears. Having quoted our Saviour's words to *Nicodemus*, that he ſaith may be credited Hiſtorically, that *unleſs a Man be born again, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*, John 3. *But what is that* (ſaith he) *to the Knowledge and Experience of the new Birth, that they are never like to be informed of there: Nor can that Scripture be my Rule in that heavenly Travel, reſpecting the many and wonderful Trials and Exerciſes, that are to be met with in the way to it.* Neither can any other Writing whatever. *This* Only *is the Office of that Spirit and Word Immortal, by which we are begotten again.* I anſwer, Here he excludes not only that place

place above mentioned, but the whole Scripture, from being instrumental to our Information, and plainly denies that any can be informed of it there; this is indeed to make it not only not the Rule, but not a Rule in this great case. But his assertion is extreamly false, the place quoted (*John* 3. 3, 5.) informs us of the necessity of Regeneration; and the following words informs us, of the way and manner how it is wrought, to wit, by the Spirit, as the principal Efficient, and by Faith in the Son of Man, as the Instrumental cause; *v.* 14, 15, 16. and this Faith is wrought instrumentally, by the Words and Doctrine of the Gospel, called by *Paul*, (*Rom.* 6. 17.) *The Form*, or Pattern, *of Doctrine*, whereunto the believing *Romans* were delivered, as the Mettal that is melted into the Mould, that frames it into a Vessel. And will *W. P.* say, that his and his *B*rethrens Preaching and Words, inform People nothing of Regeneration, nor of the manner of it, and the several steps in the progress of it. If not, their Preaching so much of the New *B*irth, and the manner of it (at least as they think) is very unprofitable; but if they think their Preaching profitable, to inform concerning Regeneration, and manner of it, then their Preaching must be better than the whole Scripture. Had he said the Scripture without the Spirit cannot guide

guide or direct us in the way of Regeneration, nor be inſtrumental towards it, without the ſame, he had not been to blame, all true Chriſtians ſay the ſame; but to exclude the Scriptures, that is, the Word and Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, from being ſo much as an Organ or Inſtrument in the hand of the Spirit, as the Spirit giveth Efficacy to it, is extreamly falſe and erronious, and contradicts the Scriptures Teſtimony, and the Experience of Thouſands, who can ſet to their Seal, that the Spirit of God has made the Scriptures, to wit, the Word and Doctrine delivered in them, Inſtrumental, both to their Conviction and Converſion. Surely *James* was of another mind than *W. P.* who ſaid, That the Faithful were begotten of the Will of God, *by the Word of Truth*, and *Peter* ſaid, They were made Partakers of the Divine Nature, by the exceeding great and precious Promiſes, (which are to be found in the Holy Scriptures) through the Operation of the Divine Power. And as falſe it is, what he ſaith, *That Experience* (to wit, *of the New Birth,*) *muſt go before all Doctrinal Scripture:* Meaning the Doctrine delivered in the Scripture, which was the ſame before it was written: This is to ſet the Cart before the Horſe, as the Proverb is, or the Fruit before the Seed; Are Men regenerated in Blindneſs and Ignorance,

rance, or rather are they not renewed in Knowledge? And this Knowledge, doth it not presuppose some doctrinal Principles, of which Men must be first convinced? Has the Doctrine of the great Love of God, in sending his Son into the World outwardly to dye for us, and inwardly to enlighten us, no Influence on our Regeneration? Was *Adam* regenerated, before God gave him the Promise of the Womans Seed, after his Fall? by his Assertion it must be so, which is wonderful Ignorance! Is he so little acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, as not to have seen the Lineaments, Steps and Progress of the *New Birth*, fairly delineated, and the whole manner of it, as clearly as any Country can be delineated in the fairest Map, with all the several Roads; but as the Map can be of no use to a blind Man, though to a seeing, it is of great use; so to a Man whom the Spirit of God has in some measure enlightned, the Scriptures are as serviceable, as a Map to a Traveller, yea, and much more, they are really the Instrument of the Spirit, both for convincing and converting Men, and the Rule according to which the Spirit leads them, in the various steps of it. It is granted, That the Experience of Regeneration, in whom it is wrought, is much more than any verbal account of it by the best of words, and gives a Man in some respect, a more satisfactory

tisfactory Knowledge of it, than any Man can have by Scripture words, or any words whatſoever, who is not himſelf regenerated, as the ſight of a Country is more, and gives a Man a more ſatisfactory account of it, than all verbal Deſcriptions or Maps can do, to him that never was in the Country. Yet this proves not, but that the Geographical account of that Country by words and Maps, truly and accurately given, by Men of great Wiſdom and Sincerety, is of great Service and Advantage, both to Strangers who deſire to ſee the Country and live in it, and alſo to them that already live in it. And for all the great Conceit that *W. P.* has of his knowledge of the great Myſtery of Regeneration, by his Experience, of which he denieth, *That the Scriptures have given him any Information:* Yet he is very ignorant of it ſtill, if he be of his former mind, as he wrote in his Preface to *R. B*'s Works, That *Regeneration is a greater Myſtery than God manifeſt in the Fleſh.* Had *W. P.* conſulted Scripture, it would have better informed him, and to be ſure, the true Experience of Regeneration, never taught him any ſuch horrid and extreamly falſe Aſſertion.

*Page* 31. He ſaith, *The knowledge of thoſe Propheſies of Chriſt's Sufferings, was by extraordinary Revelation, not falling within the ordinary Diſcoveries, that are abſolutely neceſſary to Man's Salvation, by which he ſhews his Power and Faithfulneſs*

*fulness that he is God, and can foretell, and will bring to pass. But therefore must there be an extraordinary Light or Spirit, and not rather an extraordinary Sight and Sense from out and the same Light and Spirit in them.*

*Answ.* First, this quite overthrows his Notion of a general Rule, that must be one and the same to all Mankind; for if the Prophets had extraordinary Revelation, concerning Christ's Sufferings, which other Men have not that extraordinary Revelation, was the Rule of their Faith touching that matter, which could not be the Rule of Faith to them, who had no knowledge of that thing. Secondly, Though the inward extraordinary Revelation given to the Prophets concerning Christ's Sufferings, was not necessary to others of the Faithful, who were not Prophets, for their Salvation; yet the Knowledge and Faith of them was necessary to Salvation by some other means, to wit, by having the Doctrine, given to the Prophets by extraordinary Revelation, preached, or conveyed to the Faithful by the ordinary outward means of Instruction; which differing manner of conveyance makes not any difference in the Doctrine, nor yet in the Faith of it, for Matter and Substance. Thirdly, That he makes the Faith of Christ's Sufferings, none of the absolute Necessaries to our Christianity and Salvation, because not given to us, as it was to the

the Prophets by extraordinary Revelation. This plainly gives us a new and freſh Inſtance of his *Deiſm* and *Paganiſm*, appearing with open face; for if the Faith of Chriſt's Sufferings be not neceſſary to our Salvation, becauſe we have it not given us by extraordinary Revelation, as the Prophets had (which is a falſe Conſequence) by the ſame reaſon, not one of the twelve Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, or any of the other Creeds, called the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian*, nor any one of the peculiar Doctrines and Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, are neceſſary to our Salvation, though we hear them daily preached, or may daily read them in the Holy Scriptures, becauſe by his falſe Inference, not given us by extraordinary Revelation; and at this rate no more Faith is neceſſary to our Salvation, than what any *Infidel Jew*, or *Mahometan*, or *Heathen* may have, by the common Dictates of the Light in every one of their Conſciences abſtractly conſider'd, without all means of outward Inſtruction by the Holy Scriptures, which is a plain undermining of the whole Chriſtian Religion, and introducing *Deiſm* and *Paganiſm* in its room, and is really a degree more remote from Chriſtianity, than any *Pelagianiſm* or *Socinianiſm*. Fourthly, Whereas he querieth, *Muſt there be therefore an extraordinary Light or Spirit, and not rather an extraordinary Sight or Senſe, from one and the ſame Light and Spirit in them.*

I answer, Taking *Light* and *Spirit* in the highest sense, to signifie God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit, it will not infer another *Light* or *Spirit*, but another Illumination, Inspiration and Revelation, as well as another *Sight* and *Sense*, proceeding from one and the same *Spirit*, and from one and the same *Light*, originally according to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, that teacheth there is diversity of Operations, Administrations and Gifts, but *one God, one Lord, and one Spirit.* But the words and terms *Light* and *Spirit* sometimes in Scripture, signifie some Internal Act of Illumination, and Operation, and Gift of the Spirit; as when we read of the seven Spirits of God in Scripture, and that God is called the Father of Lights, this doth not signifie seven real distinct Spirits of God, but seven Gifts or Virtues, and Operations of one and the same Spirit: And because there are several sorts of Illuminations, proceeding from one Light originally, which is God, and the *Divine Word*, therefore they are called *Lights*; and in this sense (fully agreeable to Scripture) the Prophets and all the Pen-men of the Holy Scriptures, may be said to have had an extraordinary Light and Spirit, as well as an extraordinary Sight, that others of the Faithful had not, or now have not, and yet the Faith the same for Matter and Substance [for extraordinary Revelation, may be called extraordinary

nary Light well enough] and alſo the Faithful may be ſaid to have an extraordinary Light and Spirit, that no *Infidel Jew*, *Mahometan*, *Heathen*, or meer *Moraliſt*, *Deiſt*, or meer Formal Profeſſor of Chriſtianity hath, to wit, in reſpect of the diverſity of the kinds and ſorts of the Illuminations, according to the differing ſubjects, that of the Prophets differing from that of other Faithful Men that were not Prophets, who yet had the ſame Faith, though not conveyed by the ſame manner of Illumination, and the Illumination of the Faithful differing from the common Illumination, given in common to Mankind, which in the reſpects above-mentioned, may be ſaid to be *three ſeveral Lights and Spirits*, according to the three ſeveral ſubjects, all which are but originally one and the ſame; like to which we have an Example in the Beams of the Sun, that remaining the ſame in their nature, yet according to the differing *Mediums and Subjects* of reception, ſeem wonderfully diverſified, ſo that paſſing through Glaſſes of ſeveral colours, as green, red, blew and yellow, the Beams or Rayes, will have theſe differing colours, which diverſity proceeds not from the nature of the Sun-beams, but the differing Mediums and Subjects; and thus alſo the ſame Influence of the Sun, melteth Wax and hardneth Clay; and operating on a Field where Barley is ſown, contributes to produce a Crop

of Barley; but operating on a Field where Wheat is ſown, contributes to produce a Crop of Wheat, from the differing Seeds and Subjects it works upon.

---

## Section 19.

### *His Definition of the Judge of Controverſie, lame and fallacious, as his Definition of the general Rule and Faith; in what Senſe the Spirit is the Judge of Controverſie,* quoad nos, *i.e. as to us.*

THus having gone through, and examined all that I have obſerved in his Book, giving his Reaſons and Arguments, *That the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith and Life, but the Light in every Conſcience*; and having ſhewn the Weakneſs, yea the Falſity of them, I thought it not neceſſary to take notice of his Enlargements and Amplifications on his ſeveral Arguments, but anſwer to the Argument it ſelf, wherein its ſtrength ſeemed to lye. I ſhall be brief in my Examination and anſwer to his ſecond part, to wit, concerning the Judge of Controverſie, for, becauſe it hath ſuch a neceſſary Connexion with the former, the former being clearly diſcuſſed, the latter will eaſily be determined.

*Page* 39. He gives us his explanation, what he means by theſe Terms, Judge and Con-

Controverſie. *A Judge* (ſaith he) *is one that has not only power to determine, but diſcerning to do it rightly. Controverſie is a debate between two parties, about the Truth or Falſhood, to be determined by that Judge.* But as he wrongly ſtated the Queſtion in the firſt part, about the Rule, ſo here he is very ſhort in ſtating the Controverſie about the Judge. It is without all Queſtion, among all that own that there is one great God Almighty, that he is the Great and Supreme Judge, of what is Truth and what is not, univerſally, and that moſt perfectly and infallibly; and all that believe in Chriſt and in the Holy Spirit, do own that Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, together with the Father, are that Supreme Judge, as they are one and the ſame Supreme God; and not only ſo, but all true Chriſtians own, that Chriſt, as the Son of Man, has all Judgment committed to him, and is both Head and Judge in his Church. Now that wherein *W. P.* is ſhort in ſtating the Queſtion here is, that he doth not aſſign the true Rule, whereby the Judge, to wit, God, Chriſt and the Spirit, doth give forth a definitive Judgment, to be underſtood and received, by the Members of the Church of Chriſt. Neither God, nor Chriſt, nor the Holy Spirit, need the Scripture, to give a Judgment, as to themſelves, their knowledge of what is Truth, and

what is not ſo, is wholly independent from the Scripture, but the Queſtion is to be thus ſtated, What Rule, Standard or Meaſure, God, Chriſt and the Spirit has given to the faithful, in particular, and to the whole Church in general, ſince the Doctrine of the true Faith was committed to writing, whereby they may underſtand, and know, the true Judgment and determination of God, and Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit, the Supreme Judge of Controverſie. True it is, that the Law-giver is the beſt interpreter of any point that may concern his own Law, and therefore as God is the Law-maker, ſo he is the Supreme Judge and Interpreter of his Law. But as an Earthly Law-giver, ſuppoſe an Earthly King, with the conſent of the great Counſel of the Nation, gives forth his Laws to his Subjects, if any Controverſie ariſe about the true ſenſe of thoſe Laws, the King and his Counſel that made thoſe Laws, is to determine the Controverſie by the Laws themſelves, one part of the Law ſerving as a Key, to open what is hard to be underſtood in another part of it. Thus it is in this Nation, and commonly in all Nations, for the Law is ſuppoſed to be ſuch a perfect Law, Intire and Compleat, that the Senſe of it needs not be given by giving forth any new Law, to give the ſenſe of the former; nor ought

any

any Subject to preſume to give his private Interpretation of the Law, by any private Gloſs or Senſe, which he cannot demonſtrate from the Law it ſelf; and as it's thus, as to the Laws of Men, how much more is it ſo, as to the Laws of God? The Laws of Men indeed, receive frequently new Additions and Alterations, and yet this cannot be done, but by Publick Authority: But the Law and Rule of Faith and Life, that God has given to the Faithful, and to his Church, now under the New Teſtament, is ſo full, perfect and comprehenſive, that is, fully Sufficient without any Addition; and if it can be ſuppoſed, that it may pleaſe God to give forth any new Laws to his Church, it muſt be allowed, that there muſt be the ſame Evidence, and ground of receiving them to be ſuch, as was given for the Old Teſtament by *Moſes*, and for the New Teſtament by Chriſt. Now had *W. P.* fairly ſtated the queſtion, he ſhould have ſtated it thus, Whither the Spirit of Chriſt, (whoſe Judgment and Determination is all one with that of Chriſt and the Father) doth give his Judgment to the Church, and the Members of it, by any other Law or Rule, Meaſure or Standard, than what is already to be found in the Holy Scriptures, whether relating to Articles of Faith, or poſitive Precepts of revealed and inſtituted

Religion, by Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament. Or whither the Spirit gives this Judgment, not by the Doctrines and Precepts contained in the Scriptures, but by the common discoveries and Dictates of the Light within every Man's Conscience, which are commonly the same, and of the same extent in all Mankind, be they *Jews* and *Mahometans*, and *Painims* abroad, or *Deists* at home here in *England* or elsewhere: Or lastly, whither by any new particular Discoveries, Revelations or Dictates, and new Precepts of the Spirit, not formerly given, either to Mankind in general, or to the Church in particular. To the first, all sound Christians agree. The Second is, the sence of *W. P.* and those of his *Brethren* of the Second Days Meeting that have approved his Book. The third is, the sence of some of the chief Teachers and Leaders, that first arose among the *Quakers*, that did affirm, they had new Commands given from the Spirit, by immediat Revelation from Heaven, some of which are neither the common Dictates of the Light in every Conscience of Mankind, nor to be found in the Scriptures, either expressly, or by any necessary consequence from them. And indeed the first Teachers and Leaders amongst that People, did not think it worth while, to prove their Doctrine, or warrant their

their Interpretations, by conſequences from Scripture; but the general proof was, *This is the Word of the Lord unto you*; for *G. F.* (ſee his Journal) plainly told, that when he firſt came forth, he was commanded of God, to ſay *thee* and *thou* to every Man to whom he ſpoke, and not to put off his Hat to any: Alſo the ſetting up of Womens Government in their Meetings, diſtinct from the Men, by the more devout ſort, who did think, and ſtill think, that *G. F.* was a Prophet, as immediately ſent as *Moſes*, or any other, is Judged to have been by a Divine Authority and Power in *G. F.* without any dependance on Scripture Rule, or ſeeking to fiſh it by conſequence from Scripture. And pray what need is there to bring Scripture proof, for any thing that Men either believe or practiſe, either by conſequence or expreſs words, ſeeing that is not the Rule of either Faith or practiſe, but the Light in every Conſcience, as *W. P.* ſaith here in this Book, or ſome New Revelation, or diſcovery, that neither *Jews* nor *Turks*, nor other *Deiſts* have, nor all *Chriſtendom*, but only and alone, the People called *Quakers*. But if theſe new Revelations be their Rule in the Caſe, it quite overturns *W. P*'s Fabrick, of ſetting up a general Rule of Faith and Life in every Man's Conſcience. For a new Revelation, that only one part of Mankind hath,

hath, cannot be a general Rule. *W. P.* makes not the Light within (which he will have to be the Spirit, or God himſelf, or Chriſt in every Man,) abſtractly conſidered from the inward diſcoveries, Dictates and Precepts there delivered, to be the general Rule, which he calls the Eternal Precepts of the Spirit in the Conſcience, and the Noble precepts writ in Man's Heart, Phraſes that he has borrowed from ſome Heathen writers, as *Pythagoras* and *Sophocles*, and which are to be owned in their place, to be ſuch, and to be a general Rule of moral Juſtice and Temperance, as is above owned; but not either the general Rule of the Chriſtian Religion, with reſpect to its peculiar Doctrines, and Precepts, nor indeed ſo much as any Rule at all in that ſtate; nor indeed is it at all proper to call the Spirit the Rule in his Senſe, but rather the Dictates and diſcoveries of the Spirit, which *W. P.* calls ſometimes *Revelation*, to wit, *Internal*, and the *Internal Teſtimony of the Spirit, Eternal Precepts and noble Laws writ in all Men's Hearts*; for the Spirit abſtractly conſidered, from all Internal and External diſcovery, Revelation and Teſtimony, teacheth Men nothing at all, and therefore can be no Rule to them, as ſuch. And ſeeing *W. P.* hath caſt away the Holy Scriptures from being the Rule of Faith and Practiſe even to us Chriſtians,

Chriſtians, that is, all and every one of the peculiar Doctrines and Precepts of Chriſtianity, that are to be ſure no part of thoſe Eternal Precepts and Laws writ in all Mens Conſciences, not one of them, nor all of thoſe peculiar Doctrines and Precepts, are ſo much as a part of the Chriſtians Rule of Faith and Life; for if it were, then the Chriſtians, the *Deiſts*, the *Mahometans*, and *Infidel Jews*, ſhould not have one general Rule of Faith and Life, which he contends for.

*Page* 41. He propoſeth an Objection, and pretends to ſolve it. Obj. *But is not the Scripture the Judge of Controverſie.* [He ſhould rather have made the Objection run thus, Is not the Scripture the Rule, whereby the Spirit of Truth, who is properly the Judge, doth by his inward ordinary illumination in the Faithful, determine the Controverſie, in all the neceſſary things of Salvation? Yea, and alſo in many other things, though not abſolutely neceſſary, yet very profitable.] He Anſwers. *How can that be, ſince the Queſtion moſt times ariſes about the meaning of Scripture?* I reply, yet ſtill the Scripture is the proper Rule to determine the Controverſie, even when the queſtion ariſeth about the meaning of the Scripture; becauſe what ſeemeth obſcure in ſome places of Scripture are, opened and made plain by other plain places of Scripture, treating

treating on the ſame Subject, that are as a Key to open them, without any other Rule than the Scripture it ſelf; only there is need of the Spirits Internal Illumination and aſſiſtance to help us to uſe that Key, eſpecially in reference to the ſaving knowledge of them.

He proceeds in his anſwer to the Objection, ſaying, *Is there any place* (to wit, in Scripture) *tells us, without Interpretation, whither the* Socinian *or* Trinitarian *be in the right, in their differing Apprehenſions of the Three that bear record*, &c. *Alſo the* Homouſian *and* Arian *about Chriſt's Divinity, or the Papiſts or Proteſtants about Tranſubſtantiation. If then things are left undefin'd and undetermined, I mean literally and expreſly in the Scripture, and that the Queſtion ariſes about the Senſe of words, Doth the Scripture determine which of theſe Interpreters hit the mark?* From all which he concludes, that not the Scripture, but the Interpretation muſt decide the Matter in Controverſie, and that Interpretation muſt be given from the Spirit of God, to be a true and infallible Interpretation.

*Anſw.* Seeing that Interpretation, according to *W. P.* cannot be given from the Spirit, without an extraordinary Revelation, the things in Controverſie, being ſuch (according to *W. P*'s Phraſe and Confeſſion, *P.* 31.) as fall not within the ordinary Diſcoveries, that are abſolutely neceſſary to Man's Salvation;

tion; and that *W. P.* alſo grants, that he and his Brethren have no ſuch extraordinary Revelation, for it is not needful, being none of the abſolute Neceſſaries to our Salvation, *P.* 33. It evidently follows, that neither *W. P.* nor any of his Brethren, nor indeed any other Men now living whatſoever, have any certainty whither the *Socinian* or *Trinitarian* be in the right; that is, whither Chriſt is God, and whither Chriſt had any Exiſtence before *Mary*; and whither Chriſt be in any of the Faithful, yea or nay; yea *W. P.* hath no certainty of this Fundamental Principle, that Chriſt is in him, or in any of his Brethren; the great reaſon of their Aſſertion, that Chriſt is in them, being, that Chriſt is God; ſo that if it be not certain from Scripture, that Chriſt is God; and if the *Socinian Doctrine* ſhould prove true, that Chriſt is only a Man, it will evidently follow, (as I think *W. P.* will grant) that it is utterly falſe, that Chriſt is in any Men whatſoever; and that that Light that is in Men, even the moſt Faithful, is not Chriſt; for how can that, which is only a meer Man, and a meer Creature, [as the *Socinians* ſay that Chriſt only is] be in all Men. Again, If it cannot be determined from Scripture, without extraordinary Revelation, (which *W. P.* grants, neither he nor his Brethren have, as touching theſe Matters,) whither the *Arians* or the *Homouſians* be

in

in the right; it evidently followeth, that neither *W. P.* nor his Brethren, are certain, whither the word mentioned *John* 1. 1. be any other than a meer Creature; and consequently they are not certain, but that they themselves are Idolaters, who give any Divine Worship to Christ, as he is that Word. Also if it be not certain from Scripture, whither the Papists or Protestants be in the right about *Transubstantiation*, without extraordinary Revelation, according to *W. P.*'s way of arguing, If the Papists should happen to be in the right, and *W. P.* by his Confession, knoweth nothing to the contrary but that they are, he and his Brethren should be guilty of horrid Contempt and Blasphemy, to call that which is the Body of Christ, nothing but Bread. And is not this Assertion of *W. P.* a fair Inlet to Popery, that the Scripture doth not determine expressly, without Interpretation, and that Interpretation cannot be had without new Revelation, whither the Papists Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* be true? So that to him at present, it is a Matter of Indifferency; and if *W. P.* should turn Papist, or suppose him to be one, when he declares himself, he needs only pretend a Revelation for that and all the other Matters in Controversie betwixt Protestants and Papists, to justifie him, and prove him to be no Changeling. And at this rate of *W. P.*'s arguing, not only all the peculiar

liar Doctrines of Chriſtianity are wholly uncertain, and *Papiſts*, *Socinians* and *Arians*, and other the worſt of Hereticks, that oppugn the Chriſtian Doctrine and Faith, may happen to be in the right, and theſe called the Orthodox to be in the wrong; but the great Fundamental of the *Quakers* is overthrown, and rendred uncertain alſo; yea, this very Poſition, that he laboureth ſo much to eſtabliſh, That *not the Scriptures, but the Light in every Man's Conſcience, is the Rule of Faith and Life to every Man.* For this Poſition of his, is not literally and expreſly in the Scripture; ſo that according to *W. P.* not the Scripture, but his and his Brethrens Interpretation muſt determine this Controverſie; and this cannot be done without extraordinary Revelation, it being none of thoſe things that fall within the ordinary Diſcoveries of Men, to wit, that the Light in every Man's Conſcience is Chriſt, and God, for then Chriſt would be God, and the *Socinians* would be Blaſphemers that deny him ſo to be. By all which it evidently appears, that this Argument of *W. P.* not only renders all the peculiar Doctrines of Chriſtianity meer Scepticiſm and Uncertainty; but the great Fundamental of the *Quakers*, as concerning the Light being Chriſt in them, and the Rule of their Faith, to be equally Scepticiſm and Uncertainty. But that he ſaith, Chriſt's Divinity is left undetermin'd in Scripture

ture literally and expreſly, is falſe; for it is in ſeveral places literally and expreſly affirm'd that Chriſt is God, and that and many other Truths ſuppoſe not literally and expreſly mentioned in Scripture, yet by good and neceſſary Conſequences, without all extraordinary Revelation from plain places of Scripture, can be certainly inferred. And if he will not allow that there is any certainty by arguing from the Scriptures, by Conſequences of true Reaſon, his whole Diſcourſe in this his Book that I am now anſwering is diſallowable, for he has not brought one place of Scripture, that literally and expreſly ſaith, the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith, or that the Light in every Man's Conſcience is; and he doth not pretend to extraordinary Revelation in the Caſe; and if he did or ſhall, be muſt give us leave to diſtruſt him, until he bring ſufficient Evidence for it, which I believe he will never be able to do: Yea, the Falſity of his Reaſonings by way of Conſequence, to prove his Poſition, *That not the Scripture, but the Light in every Man's Conſcience is the Rule of Faith and Life*, is evidently apparent, from the anſwers already given. And ſuppoſe he ſhould pretend to extraordinary Revelation in the caſe, and that that is the ground of his Certainty, and Rule of his Faith, even that Pretence deſtroyeth his Fabrick; for ſeeing all Men have not that extraordinary Revelation,

tion, it cannot be a general Rule. If he ſay, The common diſcovery that every Man hath, teacheth him ſufficiently without either Scripture or extraordinary Revelation, That the Light in every Man's Conſcience is the Rule of Faith. I anſwer, How can that be, unleſs it were a ſelf-evident Propoſition, as *that the whole is greater than the part*; and if it be a ſelf-evident Propoſition, why hath *W. P.* taken ſo great pains to prove it? Men commonly think it needleſs, to prove any ſelf-evident Propoſition, and properly ſpeaking, it is impoſſible to be proved. But if his ſaid Poſition has no ſelf-evidence of the Truth of it, how ſhall it be proved? not from Scripture, for that would make the Scripture the Rule; nor from Humane Reaſon, for that would make Humane Reaſon the Rule, which *W. P.* ſeems not to ſet up for the Rule. It is granted, that the Light in every Man's Conſcience, in reſpect of ſome Moral Principles of Juſtice and Temperance, has a Self evidence, and ſo far is a Rule; but that it is the Rule of Faith to Chriſtians is denied; and by whatever Medium he proveth it, that muſt be his Rule, by his manner of arguing, which runs him into the like vitious Circle as the Papiſts are run into, when they prove the certainty of Tradition by the Church, and the certainty of the Church by Tradition; ſo *W. P.* proves, that the Light within is the Rule of Faith by the Scripture, and the certainty of the Scripture by the Light within.

## Section 20.

*His Propoſal of the way, to determine all Controverſie deſtructive to the Chriſtian Religon, lets in Deiſm and Heathenism to overſpread the World, a Remedy worſe than the Diſeaſe. His miſrepreſentation of ſound Proteſtants, and falſe and uncharitable Judgment of them. Several Scripture places, that prove the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith and Life, to all Chriſtian People.*

I Confeſs he hath one very notable and plauſible Anſwer to an Objection made by himſelf *P.* 44. were it as true, as ſeemingly fair and plauſible. The Objection is this, *How will this determine Controverſie*, (*viz.*, to caſt away the Scriptures from being the general Rule of Faith and Life, and to ſet up the Light in every Man's Conſcience, according to the general Diſcoveries it gives to all Mankind) *and allay the Fury of Debates that are on foot in the World.* He anſwereth roundly, *Nothing like it, if Men adhere to it.* But firſt were it true, it would have this miſchievous and yet moſt neceſſary Conſequence, that the Chriſtian Religion would be utterly loſt, ſo far as it hath any peculiarity, or peculiar Dignity, Worth and Advantage, above *Deiſm* or *Paganiſm*. A rare Cure indeed, that *W. P.* here preſcribes to all Chriſtendom, to heal their Breaches, and end the Diſputes and Controverſies betwixt the worſt ſort of Hereticks, and the moſt Orthodox Chriſtians; and betwixt

twixt Papiſts and Proteſtants; ſuch a Remedy here preſcribed by him, is worſe than the Diſeaſe. He ſaith, Moſt Perſwaſions (he ſhould have come out more plainly with his Expedient, ſaying, moſt *Hereticks*, *Arians*, *Neſtorians*, *Sabellians*, *Eutychians*, and them of the oppoſed ſide called *Orthodox*, yea, *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants*) agree in his general Rule of Faith and Life, that is, they own the common and general Dictates of the Light in the Conſcience, and ſo doth the civilized part of the whole World of Mankind, and agree about what he makes the abſolute Neceſſaries, *viz.* That God is, that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him; that the way of God is a way of Purity, Patience, Meekneſs, *&c.* without which no Man ſhall ſee the Lord. Now all Hereticks commonly (few I think excepted) own theſe Generals, and many of them have Moral Lives; Is this enough to their eternal Salvation, though they deny the Lord that bought them with his precious Blood, as he outwardly ſuffered on the Croſs, on this pretence, that their general Rule ſet up here by *W. P.* teacheth them nothing of any ſuch Lord that bought them, with any Blood outwardly ſhed for them? Is not this the ready way to open the Flood-gate, and to let in *Deiſm* and *Heatheniſm*, to over-run not only *England*, but all Chriſtendom; and not only to deſtroy the Proteſtant Chriſtian Religion, but any remains of Chriſtian Doctrine that are in the

Popiſh Countries? But from this Cure of *W. P.* we have all great cauſe to pray, *Good Lord deliver us.* But nor would this Cure he propoſeth, be ſucceſsful upon the *Hypotheſis* of his *general Rule*, if univerſally received for a Rule. The Heathen Philoſophers, many of whom profeſſed and owned *the Light in every Conſcience*, as it did enlighten their Reaſon, yet how many great Controverſies were there among them notwithſtanding, and oft great Heats and Animoſities.

And if this Cure of *W. P.* be ſo effectual, how comes it, that it has not healed the breaches and great Controverſies, that have been on foot theſe Forty Years, chiefly about *G. Foxes* orders, his party contending that they were the Dictates of the Light, both in *G. F.* and all his followers: the other party as ſtrongly denying it, that they were any Dictates of the true Light within; and let *W. P.* tell us, when any ſuch Controverſie ariſes, which are the true Dictates of the Light and true Spirit, abſtractly conſidered from the Scripture, what ſhall be the Cure in that Caſe? He ſeems indeed to give an anſwer to this in *Page* 42. Anſw. *By the ſame Spirit as well ſaid* Gualt. Cradock, *the way to know, whither the Spirit be in us, is its own Evidence, and that is the way to know it in others too; and the Man that hath the Spirit, may know the Spirit in another. There is* (ſaith he) *a kind of Sagacity in the Saints to this purpoſe.*

*purpoſe.* To this I anſwer, where the Spirits Doctrine, which is the Doctrine both of Chriſt and the Father, goeth along with the Spirit, according to *Iſaiah* 59 21. and many other places of Scripture, there is a great Truth in it; but whatever Spirit either teacheth another Doctrine, or draweth Men away from the neceſſary belief of Chriſt's Death in the Fleſh, in being a Sacrifice for our Sins, and other Fundamental Principles peculiar to Chriſtianity, is not the true Spirit of Chriſt, whatever Unity or Sagacity *W. P.* and his Brethren may think they have, to know it in one another, while he and they make nothing to be the Rule of Faith, but *the Light in every Conſcience* (*John* 2. 9.) which teacheth not this Doctrine of Faith, nor propoſeth this great Object of Faith, to wit, *Chriſt Crucified* to the Conſcience, they deſtroy all neceſſity of that Faith, as concerned in our Salvation: However with plauſible ſhews, he and they will ſay it is neceſſary, where the Hiſtory, as he terms it, has reached; but how? not for Salvation, but hiſtorically, as we believe the Hiſtory of *Alexander* or *Julius Ceſar*, or as *W. P.* and his Brethren pretend to believe *G. F*'s Journal.

The Difficulty that he moves *P.* 41. about Interpretation of Scripture, is eaſily reſolved, without any new material object of Faith, if the Spirit of God be acknowledged inwardly to enlighten the Underſtandings of the

the faithful, and that they faithfully receive the same, it will infallibly, give to all the Faithful, so much of the true knowledge and Faith of all Scripture Doctrine, as is necessary to Salvation. *Page.* 46. As unfair and fallacious as he hath been, in his Definitions and Arguments about the Rule of Faith and Life, no less unfair and fallacious is he, in his representing many Orthodox and sincere Protestants, as if they judged the *Quakers* for their asserting an unerring, certain, or infallible Judgment in things necessary to Salvation. This is a very unfair representation of them: The Question lyeth not about an unerring certain and infallible Judgment, given by the Spirit of God to all the faithful, in the things necessary to Salvation, which they fully assert. But the Question lyeth here, whither they have this infallible Judgment, either by the common Discoveries and Dictates of the Light in every Man's Conscience, or by any new discoveries of the Spirit, abstractly and seperately considered from the Scriptures; so that the Doctrine, as delivered in the Holy Scriptures, is not the Rule, or Instrument, whereby the Spirit works or begets this infallible Judgment in them, in all the necessary things of Salvation, [which yet are more and others, than those assigned by *W. P.*] to wit, Faith in Christ crucified, and raised again, and other fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion.

A Second part of the question is, Whither all, or any of the *Quakers*, when met in their Yearly Meetings, or any other Meetings, or the most enlightned among them, have an infallible Judgment given them in all things, as their chief Teachers have asserted; so that they are not only infallible in the most necessary things, but in other things; Yea, in all that they have given forth, either in Preaching or Writing, as the Word of the Lord, and with an Authority the same in kind with the Prophets, as *W. P.* doth in the Conclusion of this Book, where he pretends that he has a Message to tell them, and that from the Spirit

tit of the Lord God of Truth. and that is, *Page* 48. *That Men unregenerated, for all their external imitations, of the Ancients in ſome Temporary and figurative parts of Worſhip, will never be accepted.* But this is no extraordinary Revelation, it is a Doctrine that is daily taught, and generally believed among all true Chriſtians, that never were under the profeſſion of *Quakers*. But the fallacy is here, that all are unregenerate in his Senſe, who own, that what they are taught and helped to believe know or practiſe, is by the Doctrine contained in the Holy Scriptures, as the Rule of their Faith and Life, and Inſtrument of the Spirits preparing and giving them, the Spirit himſelf being the principal efficient. Author and Cauſe, and primary principle of their Knowledge, Faith and Practiſe. Yet all this is Judged by *W. P.* here in his Concluſion, to be nothing, but *a literal Knowledge, Hiſtorical Faith, and outward Religion, that is but as the Old Heaven, that are to be wrapt up as a ſcrol, and the Old Wine and Bottles that belong not to the Kingdom of God.* For which Uncharitable and Falſe Judgment, I heartily pray God that he may forgive him, and giving him a better underſtanding, and reclaim him, (if it be the bleſſed Will of God) from thoſe moſt dangerous errors he is intangled in, and eſpecially from this, that is the foundation of his other errors, to wit, his Deiſm and ſetting up the Light within, or Spirit, or whatever he calls it, abſtractly and ſeperately from Chriſt's Doctrine and Words, even theſe divine Oracles and Words which the Father gave to Chriſt, and Chriſt gave them, by his Holy Spirit to the Apoſtles, *John* 17. 8. And by the ſame Holy Spirit, by means of the Apoſtles writing has given to all the faithful ſince; thus dividing what God and Chriſt have Joyned together, ſurely this cannot be the true Light nor Spirit in him, or his Brethren, that leads away People from hearing the true Shepherds Voice, either as it is outwardly ſounded in the outward Miniſtry of the Word, outwardly Preached, or as it is inwardly ſounded and Ecchoʼd by

by the Holy Spirit, in Teaching the faithful to believe the ſame Doctrine, that is outwardly delivered in the Holy Scriptures. *My Sheep*, ſaid Chriſt, *hear my Voice*; they that draw from Chriſt's Doctrine, being the Rule of Faith and Life to every true Chriſtian, draw from the Spirit of Chriſt, and from his Voice, whatever ſeeming pretences they fallaciouſly make, to exalt the Spirit, by rejecting that Inſtrument, to wit, the Rule of the Holy Scriptures, by which the Spirit doth both enlighten the faithful, and beget Faith and Hope, and Love in them, by the precious Oracles and Teſtimonies therein contained; and alſo doth refreſh, quicken and comfort them, If the Spirit, and his divine influences be the Wine that refreſheth and cheriſheth them; the Scripture ſo to ſpeak, are the Flagons that convey it to them, according to the words in the Song, Cant. 2. 5. *Stay me with Flagons, comfort me with Apples*, and many other plain Teſtimonies of Scripture, that hold forth in God's ordinary way the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, as outwardly delivered, to be the means (and therefore the Rule) by which the Spirit doth both Teach, and alſo Quicken, Comfort and ſtrengthen them; ſuch as theſe following places, which I recommend to *W. P.* and his Brethrens Conſideration, *Pſal.* 19. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. *Prov.* 6. 23. *Pſal.* 119. 4, 5, 6, 18, 49, 50, 105. *Pſal.* 147. 19, 20. *Iſaiah* 8. 20. 59. 21. *John* 10. 3. *John* 17. 8, 20. *John* 20. 31. *John* 5. 39. *Acts* 10. 44. *Rom.* 16. 17. *Rom.* 16. 25. 26. *Gal.* 3. 2. *Eph.* 1. 13. 1 *Theſ.* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. 2 *Tim.* 2. 20. 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17.

28th of the Firſt
Month, 1699.

*G. K.*

FINIS.

4. FE 62

35